



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



Church

777

THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
Quarterly Review.



Πύλαι ἔδωκ' οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῇς.—*Matt. xvi. 18.*

DONATED BY THE
WHOLESALE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
NEW YORK

VOL. XI.

LONDON:
WILLIAM EDWARD PAINTER, STRAND;

AND ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

MDCCCLXII.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

58324A

ASTOR. LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1922 L

NEW YORK
PUBLIC
LIBRARY

CONTENTS.

ART.

PAGE

I. THE PARKER SOCIETY.

1. The Publications of the Parker Society. The Works of Nicholas Ridley, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of London. Edited, for the Parker Society, by the Rev. Henry Christmas, M.A., F.S.A.
2. The Sermons of Edwin Sandys, D.D., sometime Lord Archbishop of York. Edited, for the Parker Society, by the Rev. John Ayre, M.A. 1

II. CAPTAIN BASIL HALL'S PATCHWORK.

- Patchwork. By Captain Basil Hall, R.N., F.S.A. . . . 28

III. PALMER v. WISEMAN—ROMISH IDOLATRY AND SUPERSTITION.

1. A Letter respectfully addressed to the Rev. J. H. Newman, upon some Passages in his Letter to the Rev. Dr. Jelf. By N. Wiseman, D.D., Bishop of Melipotamus.
2. A Letter to N. Wiseman, D.D. (calling himself Bishop of Melipotamus), containing Remarks on his Letter to Mr. Newman. By the Rev. William Palmer, M.A.
3. A Second Letter to N. Wiseman, D.D., on the Foundation of the Romish Doctrines of Satisfaction, Indulgences, Purgatory, and Suffrages for the Dead. By the Rev. William Palmer, M.A.
- 4, 5. Third and Fourth Letters to N. Wiseman, D.D., on the Romish Doctrine of Satisfaction. By the Rev. William Palmer, M.A.
6. Remarks on a Letter from the Rev. William Palmer, M.A. By N. Wiseman, D.D., Bishop of Melipotamus.
7. A Fifth Letter to N. Wiseman, D.D., containing a Reply to his Remarks on Letter I., with additional Proofs of the Idolatry and Superstition of Romanism. By the Rev. William Palmer, M.A.
8. *Le Véritable Trésor Caché, ou Definition des Indulgences, suivres d'un Récueil de Bulles des Souveraines Pontifes, avec quelques pratiques de piété extraits de meilleurs maîtres de la vie spirituelle.*
9. *Il Tesoro di Grazia, ossia Raccolta d' Indulgenze conceduto in perpetuo dai Sommi Pontefici a tutti i fedeli de l' uno e dell' altro sesso.*
10. Indulgences granted by Sovereign Pontiffs to the Faithful who perform the Devotions and Pious Works pre-

scribed. Collected by a Member of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgence in Rome, and translated into English, with permission of Superiors : to which are added the Prayers at Mass. Second edition, improved. 41

IV. THE ANCIENT EGYPTIANS.

Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians. Second series. By Sir J. G. Wilkinson, F.R.S. 2 vols., and a volume of Plates 62

V. THE VOLUNTARY PRINCIPLE AT A DISCOUNT.

1. **Circular to the Clergy of the Establishment.** By Richard Burdon Sanderson, Esq., formerly Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, and sometime Secretary of Presentations to the late Lord Chancellor Eldon.
2. **The Autobiography of an Obsolete Churchman ; in a Letter to the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.** By R. B. Sanderson, Esq., &c. &c.
3. **The Church of England and the Church of Christ : a Lecture delivered in the Town Hall, Hertford.** By the Rev. John Burnet 93

VI. HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE EXPLAINING AWAY SYSTEM OF INTERPRETATION.

1. **Deus, Natura, Gratis. Sive Tractatus.** Per Fr. Franciscum à Sancta Clara.
2. **No. 90, Tracts for the Times.** Second edition.
3. **Brief Remarks upon No. 90, second edition, and some subsequent Publications in Defence of it.** By the Rev. P. C. Golightly, M.A.
4. **The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly Represented.** By William Cunningham.
5. **A Letter on Catholic Unity.** By Dr. Wiseman.
6. **A Second Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., in reference to his Letter to the Rev. W. Jelf, D.D.** By George Miller, D.D.
7. **A Short Enquiry into the Doctrine of the Churches of England and Rome.** By a Lay Member of the Established Church.
8. **Faith, Hope, and Charity.** By Peter Augustine Baines, D.D., Bishop of Siga, &c.
- 9 to 16. **Charges of the Archbishops of Canterbury, and of the Bishops of Durham, Winchester, Lincoln, Chester, Gloucester and Bristol, Exeter, and Ripon.**
17. **The Thirty-nine Articles considered as the Standard and Test of the Doctrines of the Church of England.** By Godfrey Faussett, D.D. 116

VII. THE CHURCH IN IRELAND.

1. The State of Ireland considered, and Measures proposed for Restoring Tranquillity to that Country. By the Right Hon. Lord Alvanley.
2. A Digest of the Penal Laws passed against Catholics, with Historical Notes and Illustrations. By the Rev. J. Waterworth.
3. A Letter on Catholic Unity, addressed to the Right Hon. the Earl of Shrewsbury. By Nicholas, Bishop of Melipotamus.
4. Exeter Hall, or Church Polemics. By Alexander Baillie Cochrane, Esq., M.P. for Bridport 157

VIII. COLONIZATION.

1. An Account of the Settlements of the New Zealand Company. By the Hon. H. W. Petre.
2. New Zealand, South Australia, and New South Wales. By R. S. Jameson, Esq.
3. Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North West and Western Australia. By George Grey, Esq., Governor of South Australia.
4. Western Australia : comprising a Description of the Vicinity of Australind. By T. J. Buckton, Esq.
5. Hand-book of Emigrants : being a History of New Zealand. By John Bright, Esq.
6. New Zealand and the New Zealanders. By Ernest Dieffenback, M.D.
7. New Zealand in 1839 ; or, Four Letters to the Right Hon. Earl Durham. By John Dunmore Lang, D.D.
8. The Present State, Resources, and Prospects of New Zealand. By E. Campbell.
9. Observations on the Climate of New Zealand. By W. Swainson, Esq.
10. Reconnoitring Voyages and Travels, with Adventures in South Australia, &c. By W. H. Leigh, Esq. Second edition.
11. An Address to the New Zealand Emigrants. By the Rev. Dr. Rudge, D.D.
12. Reports and Dispatches of the Earl of Durham on British North America 178

IX. THE STATE OF THE NATION.

1. Party Politics and Political Prospects.
2. Ireland : her Church and her People. By a Tory.
3. The Journal of the Working Classes 201

ECCLESIASTICAL REPORT.

	PAGE
The Church and the Government; The Oxford Poetry Professorship; The Bishop of the United Church in Jerusalem; The Birth of a Prince; The Ecclesiastical Commission; The Lord Mayor of Dublin; Church-rates	223

GENERAL LITERATURE.

Nuces Philosophicæ. By E. Johnson	237
The Omnipresence of the Deity. By Robert Montgomery	240
Woman. By Robert Montgomery	240
Satan; or, Intellect without God. By Robert Montgomery	250
Lectures on Paley	240
On the Sufficiency of the Parochial System, without a Poor-rate, for the right Management of the Poor	240
Episcopacy and Presbytery. By the Rev. Archibald Boyd, M.A.	241
A New English Grammar, &c. By Alexander Allen	243
Poems. By Thomas Powell	244
A Memoir of the Life and Ministry of the Rev. Watts Wilkinson, B.A.; with Extracts from his Correspondence	246
Family Secrets for those who wish to make Home happy	247
The Juvenile Scrap-book	247
The Mortality, Sufferings, and Diseases of Grinders	248
Winkle's Cathedrals	249
The National Church of England, Ancient, Apostolical, Pure	250
An Essay on the Influence of Welch Tradition upon the Literature of Germany, France, and Scandinavia	251
The Queen and the Quakers; or, a Voice from Exeter	251
The Letters of Peter Platitude on Cambridge and the Cantabs	252
Hints from a Schoolmistress, to Mothers, Daughters, and Governesses, on the Practical Application of the Principles of Education	252
An Introduction to the Dialogues of Plato	252
Garrison Sermons. By the Rev. T. T. H. Le Mesurier, M.A.	253
The History of Poland and Russia. By Miss Julia Corner	253
The Christian Diary	254
Notes on the Contributions of the Rev. George Townsend, B.A., to the New Edition of Foxe's Martyrology	254
Six more Letters on Foxe's Acts and Monuments	254
Illustrations of the Tragedies of Æschylus and Sophocles	255
Confessions of an Apostate	255
On the Apostasy predicted by St. Paul	255
The Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities	255
Ancient Christianity	255
Report of the Syrian Medical Aid Association	256
Sermons	256

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
I. THE CHURCH OF ROME AND OXFORD THEOLOGY : REV. DR. PUSEY AND THE REV. DR. MILEY.	
The Church of Rome and Oxford Theology, and the Tracts for the Times. Correspondence between the Rev Dr. Pusey and the Rev. Dr. Miley. . . .	258
II. MORAL AND POLITICAL TENDENCY OF THE MODERN NOVELS.	
1. Some Account of My Cousin Nicholas. By Thomas Ingoldsby, Esq. To which is added, The Rubber of Life. 3 vols.	
2. The Trustee. 3 vols.	286
III. THE FINE ARTS IN ENGLAND.	
1. The Fine Arts in England, and their Prospects, considered relative to National Education. By Edward Edwards.	
2. The Origin, Progress, and Present Condition of the Fine Arts in Great Britain and Ireland. 2 vols.	
3. A Commission to Enquire into the Present Condition of the Fine Arts in Great Britain, and the Means of Improving them	310
IV. THE ANGLO-SAXON CONFESSION.	
1. The Anglo-Saxon Church ; its History, Revenues, and General Character. By Henry Soames, M.A., Author of " The History of the Reformation," " Elizabethan Religious History," &c. The second edition, with additions and corrections.	
2. The Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth—Anglo-Saxon Period. By Francis Palgrave, F.R.S. and F.S.A. 2 vols. 4to. .	
3. The Saxon Chronicle ; with an English Translation and Explanatory Notes. By the Rev. J. Ingram, B.D., formerly Anglo-Saxon Professor at Oxford. Post 4to.	

ART.	PAGE
4. The Book of Ratramn, the Priest and Monk of Corbey, commonly called Bertram, on the Body and Blood of the Lord ; to which is added an Appendix, containing the Saxon Homily of Ælfric. 1 vol., 12mo. . . .	341
V. THE DIVINE RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE.	
The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice ; or, a Defence of the Catholic Doctrine, that Holy Scripture has been, since the Times of the Apostles, the sole Divine Rule of Faith and Practice to the Church, against the Dangerous Errors of the Authors of the Tracts for the Times, and the Romanists, &c. By W. Goode, M.A. . . .	357
VI. ROBERT MONTGOMERY'S LUTHER.	
Luther ; a Poem. By the Rev. Robert Montgomery, M.A., of Lincoln College, Oxford	375
VII. GYPSIES OF SPAIN.	
The Zincali ; or, an Account of the Gypsies of Spain. By George Borrow. 2 vols.	397
VIII. ECCLESIASTICAL DISTRICTS.	
Church Building Statutes, from 59 Geor. III., to 1st, 2nd, and 3rd of Victoria	411
IX. THE CONSERVATIVES AT WORK.	
1. Sir Robert Peel's Financial Statement in the House of Commons, March 11th, 1842.	
2. Speech of Sir Robert Peel on the Corn Laws, in the House of Commons, on February 9th, 1842.	
3. Speeches in Parliament—Sessions 1840 and 1841	427

ECCLESIASTICAL REPORT.

The Queen's Speech ; The Christian Knowledge Society ; The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts ; Colonial Bishoprics ; Addresses to the Archbishop and Bishops on the Tracts for the Times ; The Baptism of the Prince of Wales ; Addresses to the King of Prussia ; The Cambridge Camden Society ; Converts to Romanism	456
---	-----

GENERAL LITERATURE.

	PAGE.
Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Michael Thomas Sadler .	475
Memoir of the Life of Richard Phillips	478
Adoration, Aspiration, and Belief. By Eliza Flower . .	479
The Garland. By Mendelsohn Bartholdy	479
I'll think then of thee. By J. G. Lachner	479
The Tongue of Time ; or, the Language of a Church Clock .	480
Poems. By William Wordsworth	481
Roman Misquotation ; or, certain Passages from the Fathers, adduced in a Work entitled " The Faith of Catholics," &c., brought to the test of the originals, and their perverted character demonstrated	488
Manasseh ; a Tale of the Jews	488
The Life of the Rev. Charles Wesley, M.A., sometime Student of Christ Church, Oxford ; comprising a Review of his Poetry, Sketches of the Rise and Progress of Methodism, with notices of contemporary events and characters . . .	489
Catholicity versus Sibthorp ; or, some help to answer the question whether the Rev. R. Sibthorp, B.D., is now or ever was a Catholic	490
A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities	490
Confessions of an Apostate By the author of " Felix de Lisle" .	490
Canadian Scenery	491
Scenery and Antiquities of Ireland	491
Winkle's Cathedrals. Illustrations of the Cathedral Churches of England and Wales	491
The Kings of the East : an Exposition of the Prophecies deter- mining from Scripture and from History the Power from whom the mystical Euphrates is being dried up ; with an explanation of certain other Prophecies concerning the restoration of Israel	491
Acta Concilii Tridentini. Anno MDLXII. et MDLXIII. usque in finem Concilii Pio IV. Pont. Max. et Alia Multa circa dictum Concilium fragmenta. A Gabriele Cardinale Paleot- to descripta, nunc primum in lucem vindicata e Codice MS. olim penes Fridericum Comitem de Guilford	492
The Works of William Jay	492

	PAGE.
The Harmony of Protestant Confessions, exhibiting the Faith of the Churches of Christ, reformed after the pure and holy doctrine of the Gospel throughout Europe	493
Parochial Sermons. By the Rev. W. Gresley, M.A. . . .	493
The Old Testament, with a Commentary, consisting of short Lectures for the daily use of families	493
Ecclesiastica, the Church, her Schools, and her Clergy . . .	494
Eight Letters concerning the Blessed Trinity	494
Congregationalism ; or, the Polity of Independent Churches viewed in relation to the State and Tendencies of modern Society	495
A Plain and Practical View of the Liturgy	495
The Church and State Gazette	496
The Music of the Church	497
Foxe's Book of Martyrs	497
The Office and Work of the Holy Spirit	497
Palmer's Map of Arabia Petræa, the Holy Land, and part of Egypt, designed chiefly to illustrate those parts of the Old Testament which relate to the Exodus and Journeyings of the Israelites, and their settlement in the Land of Promise	498
The Lost Brooch ; or, the History of another Month . . .	498
Sintram and his Companions ; or, a Northern Tale . . .	498
The Christian Month ; or, a series of Original Hymns . . .	499
Zahra, a Tale of Granada, and Minor Poems	499
The Christian Offering	499
Select Poetry	500
Verses by a Poor Man	501
Scraps from the Knapsack of a Soldier	504
Ovid's Epistles in English Verse, with some Original Poems .	505
Hints from a Schoolmistress to Mothers, Daughters, and Governesses, on the application of the principles of Education .	506
The Collects of the Liturgy of the Church of England catechetically explained. By the Rev. Charles Miller, A.B. . . .	506
Observations on the Book of Ruth, and on the word "Redeemer"	506
Rational Reading Lessons : or, Intellectual Exercises for Children	507
Twenty-one Plain Doctrinal and Practical Sermons	507
Sermons	507

THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
Quarterly Review.

JANUARY, MDCCCXLII.

ART. I.—*The Publications of the Parker Society. The Works of Nicholas Ridley, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of London.* Edited for the Parker Society by the Rev. HENRY CHRISTMAS, M.A., F.S.A. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1841.

2. *The Sermons of Edwin Sandys, D.D., sometime Lord Archbishop of York.* Edited for the Parker Society by the Rev. JOHN AYRE, M.A. Cambridge: at the University Press.

THERE are few periods in the history of our Church so interesting as that which is commonly called "The Reformation," viz., the period from the divorce of Catherine of Arragon to the accession of Elizabeth. There are, however, none about which more gross mistakes prevail. We believe that were we to ask the generality of what are called *well* educated men what was their idea, their leading idea, of the period in question, they would say, that the whole country was sunk deep in the darkness of Popery when Henry VIII. first cast his eyes on ¹Anna Bullen, and began to form schemes to rid himself of his lawful and virtuous consort, Catherine of Arragon; these schemes being retarded by the Pope, the violent and impetuous monarch threw off the pontifical authority, and imported Lutheran doctrines; so that during the latter days of this prince the nation was remarkably enlightened on religious topics: that Edward VI. carried on the same work; that Mary prevented and suppressed it, contrary to the wishes of her people; and that finally, on the accession of Elizabeth, everything was peaceably settled, as it was before Mary's accession, and as it has continued ever since. In a word, that "we were (as is observed by the Editor of the "Tracts of the Anglican Fathers") one day *Papists*—blind, depraved, and bigoted; and the next, by Act of Parliament, *Protestants*—

enlightened, reformed, and charitable." That, moreover, on account of the manifold corruptions of the Roman Church, we *separated ourselves* from her communion, and established a new one, pure and scriptural. Such is the leading idea of the Reformation in the minds of those who, on things in general, are tolerably well informed. If, therefore, errors so extensive prevail, *and prevail they do*, there is every reason why that period of our ecclesiastical history should be more closely studied than ever, and information *carried* to those who are not likely to fetch it for themselves. These 'errors have mainly arisen from two causes : first, ignorance of the principles of Church government; and, secondly, the perpetual use of the term Protestant. The one has blinded the eyes of the student to the *effect* of the admissions he makes by this scheme; the other has tended to confound our Church with the reformed sects on the continent, and to induce a belief that what was lawful in *their necessity* is also lawful in *our abundance*.

We shall in this paper endeavour to bring before the mind of the reader some of the chief facts and characters of those eventful days, not simply as facts and characters, but as leaving the impress of their own might on the age in which they lived, and thereby influencing all posterity. In so doing, we cannot avoid looking, from time to time, to the German and Swiss Reformers, showing the mutual influence these and our own Reformers had one on another, and how *we* were preserved from the evils which *their* counsels would infallibly have brought upon the Anglican Church. It seems practically to have escaped the notice of men in general, that the gradual corruptions of the Roman Church called forth, as the stream went onward, many indignant remonstrances from the wise and good within her own pale, and that, even before the Lutheran era, her hold on men of learning and intellect was but the tie of expediency. Italy was overrun with secret infidelity; Spain and Portugal with secret Judaism; Germany had long been taught that armies might be arrayed against Papal power, and that bombs were more efficacious than bulls; in France so universal a dissoluteness prevailed, that *no* religion was enthroned in the hearts of the people; and as for princes, Francis I. was no more of a devotee than Henry VIII., while Charles V. was prepared either to support or assail the Pope, just as his own political interests might sway him.

At this period, too, the notoriously secular character—not to use a harsher term—of the pontiffs themselves militated much against their claims: there was no Gregory VII., with his high tone of devotion, his sanctity of life, and his unshaken oneness

of purpose ; no Innocent III., with his lofty pretensions, his enormous spiritual claims, and his almost sublime confidence. The atrocities of Alexander VI. were yet fresh in the memories of men ; and neither Julius II. nor Leo X. did aught to restore a spiritual character to the see of Rome.

In England, too, ever since the time of Wickliffe, and even before, the minds of reflecting persons had long been unsettled upon points of religion. It had been said that if you met three persons on the road, two of them would be Lollards. Such were the circumstances under which the Lutheran Reformation was commenced—such was the train to which, in this country, the fierce passions of Henry VIII. set the match. In addition to this, it must be remembered that the art of printing had just been discovered ; and books, which had hitherto been the luxuries of the learned, became accessible to the middle classes : thus, whatever was printed, some knowledge could not fail of being communicated ; and the publications of the Papists themselves only tended to show the world that those tenets, which heretofore it had been deemed blasphemy to question, were now matters of open dispute among the most accomplished and erudite of divines.

This state of affairs, however, although now by the press first made known to the world, was far from a new one. Dante, the boldest, the greatest of Reformers, had, with a stern energy which no other writer ever possessed, laid bare in his mighty work the corruptions of the Roman Church ; he had exposed the venality, the false doctrine, the lax discipline, which even in his time was doing its work of destruction ; and ventured to exhibit to the eyes of astonished scholars, the successors of St. Peter, not only as doing penance in their own purgatory, but as condemned for their misdeeds to the fiercer flames of hell. Berengarius had, at an age still earlier, attacked and demolished the doctrine of transubstantiation ; and though his book was condemned, and he himself compelled to recant, yet his opinions became known ; and the evident leaning of Gregory VII. to his favour tended to produce a conviction, that opinions so leniently beheld by such a judge could not be dangerous. Earlier still, Ratramnus, or Bertram, had promulgated the same doctrine, and found a not unwilling listener in Charles the Bald. Again, to take later instances, Chaucer, though neither a divine nor a dissenter, as some persons foolishly call him, felt the iniquities of a corrupt Church, and hesitated not to expose them. All these persons submitted under protest, and *their* protest was made to the *learned*, not to the *illiterate*—to *courts*, not to *labourers*—to the *universities*, not to the *mob*.

But the learned had been thus led to look for centuries on the dark, as well as the bright side of Roman ecclesiastical polity ; and when the convulsion came they were prepared to join either side, as their desire of reform, or their fears of anarchy, prevailed most. At the same time there were, in England especially, many strong points which kept the existing hierarchy from any danger of sudden changes from popular commotion. The free spirit of the English had long prevented any appearance of Papal oppression: the kingdom was one in which the Pope might have *influence*, but could have no *power* ; and the people looked at him (the prospect being softened and mellowed by the distance) as a holy father, and not as a spiritual tyrant. It has never been even pretended that, at the time immediately preceding the Lutheran Reformation, the Papacy was unpopular in England. On the other hand, the parochial system, with all its advantages, was fairly carried into execution—the people had Church room and *went to Church* ; and, even while Lollardism spread to an immense extent among them, they never withdrew themselves from the ministrations of the regular clergy: the monasteries, spread over the face of the land in great numbers, were sources of relief to the poor, far more efficient than any poor laws have been since—of instruction to the ignorant—of patronage to the deserving—and were, in spite of all that has been said about monastic laziness and monastic vice, repositories of more learning and more virtue than the Lutheran Reformation had to offer.

In thus speaking, we must remind *some* of our readers (and very grieved are we that we have any necessity of reminding them) that we are neither Romanists nor Oxford Tractarians. We allow the necessity of a reformation—we admit the corruptions of Rome, in all their enormities ; we are no admirers of the monastic system ; we allow the deeds of sin perpetrated in many of its institutions : but we are not persuaded, nor will all the excitement of Exeter Hall ever convince us, that previously to Henry VIII. there was neither virtue nor religion in England. What we want to impress as much as possible on the minds of our readers is simply thus—that the English Reformation and the German Reformation were widely different things, arising from different degrees of necessity, and carried on under totally different circumstances. *Here* it was begun by the temporal head of the Church, and managed, under him, by the regularly consecrated bishops of that Church. Had it been confined to spirituals, it would have been perfect, and the state of the nation at present would have been more happy and prosperous than is, perhaps, consistent with the conditions of human nature. But though we look upon it, as it was, as the greatest blessing ever

bestowed upon this country, we must not forget that it was an ecclesiastical as well as a doctrinal reformation; and while the one can hardly be rated too high, the other can scarcely be treated with too much severity. So far as *the Church* was concerned, all was well—so far as *the Establishment* was concerned, all was ill. We see, on the one side, purity of heart, singleness of purpose, and zeal for God's glory; and on the other, rapacity, ignorance, cruelty, and utter carelessness both of the present and future welfare of the people. Let any student of history compare Henry VIII. and Cranmer—Ridley and the Protector Somerset; let him trace the motives which influenced each, and the manner in which each regarded the Church, and he will soon be convinced that we have purchased our purity of doctrine at a price which, were not that purity of doctrine utterly inestimable, would be dear indeed.

We arrive, then, at two facts: first, that the preparation for a reformed faith was much greater than is usually imagined; and, secondly, that though that mass of events called "the Reformation" did incalculable good, it did also enormous evil. We must deduct this evil, and also the previous preparation of the public mind, before we can fairly estimate the effects of what we commonly call the Reformation: and *even then* we must allow that it was the *greatest blessing* ever bestowed on this country. For, first, let us take the opinions and testimony of an eye-witness (one, too, best of all qualified to speak) as to the condition of England during the Marian persecution:—

"But (alas) of late, into this spiritual possession of the heavenly treasure of these godly riches are entered in thieves, that have robbed and spoiled all this heavenly treasure away. I may well complain on these thieves, and cry out upon them with the prophet, saying, 'Deus, venerunt gentes in hæreditatem tuam,' &c. (Psalm lxxix.) O Lord God, the Gentiles, heathen nations, are come into thy heritage, they have defiled thy holy temple, and made Jerusalem an heap of stones; that is, they have broken and beat down to the ground thy holy city. This heathenish generation, these thieves of Samaria, these Sabæi and Chaldæi, these robbers have rushed out of their dens, and have robbed the Church of England of all the aforesaid holy treasure of God; they have carried it away and overthrown it; and in the stead of God's holy word, the true and right administration of Christ's holy sacraments, as of baptism and others, they mixed their ministry with men's foolish phantasies, and many wicked and ungodly traditions withal. In the stead of the Lord's holy table, they give the people, with much solemn disguising, a thing which they call their mass; but, in deed and in truth, it is a very masking and mockery of the true supper of the Lord.

"Now, for the common public prayers, which were in the vulgar tongue, these thieves have brought in again a strange tongue, whereof the people understand not one word. Wherein, what do they else

but rob the people of their divine service, wherein they ought to pray together with the minister? And to pray in a strange tongue, what is it but, as St. Paul calleth it, barbarousness, childishness, unprofitable folly, yea, and plain madness? For the godly Articles of unity in religion, and for the wholesome Homilies, what do these thieves place in the stead of them, but the Pope's laws and decrees, lying legends, and feigned fables and miracles, to delude and abuse the simplicity of the rude people? Thus this robbery and theft is not only committed—nay, sacrilege and wicked spoil of heavenly things—but also, in the stead of the same, is brought in and placed the abominable desolation of the tyrant Antiochus, of proud Sennacherib, of the shameless-faced king of the Babylonical beast.”—*Ridley's Piteous Lamentation.*

But we must turn to the strong-headed and strong-handed king who first, as we are taught to believe, reformed us. Burnet, who evidently leans to Henry's side, will hardly be classed with high Churchmen; and we may even, without offending the semi-dissenter, remark, that the king's plea of his conscience troubling him, about his marriage with his brother's widow, is one which is borne out by many circumstances of the time, and which it is impossible to disprove. How far the beauty of Anna Bullen may have urged his doubts into action, is another question: but great as was the canonical learning which permitted Henry VII. to solemnize a marriage between his son and Catherine of Arragon, and unprincipled as was Henry VIII., and superior in every point, as a woman and a Christian, as was the divorced queen to her successor, it *may* nevertheless be strongly doubted whether the king's first marriage *were* a lawful one: and those who believe it unlawful may justly condemn the conduct of the Pope for hesitating to annul it. Then again with regard to Henry's assumption of the government of the Church, he assumed the “regale,” but not the “pontificale;” nor is it possible to prove that the king ever passed, *in spiritual matters*, beyond the bounds of his just prerogative. Then with regard to the separation so much spoken of, the Anglican Church never took one step towards it: the Papal court anathematized and excommunicated our princes, declared the whole kingdom in a state of schism, and refused to acknowledge our orders—but those orders were valid, because derived, through unbroken channels, from more ancient sources than any of the popes existing, or any councils existing, during the period of change. Satisfied, therefore, that the validity of their ordinations and consecrations depended on no Papal fiat, the English bishops and priests went quietly, so far as domestic persecution would let them, on their way, and never went out of it to prove what they took altogether for granted, viz., that the apostolical succession needed not Papal ratification at every step to ensure its validity. Another fact, too, which ordinary readers

are too apt to overlook, is, that while the eyes of men were becoming daily more open to the abuses of the Roman hierarchy, those abuses were daily increasing—while truth was making daily progress in the world, the Church of Rome was making daily advances in doctrinal error; and, as though in spite of truth and Scripture, at the very time when the Anglican Reformers were perfecting their work, setting the minds of their disciples free from all fetters, save those of God's law, the divines of the Roman Church were engaged in the Council of Trent, forging anew the chains of former councils, and pledging the Church and the Papacy to all the sentiments which might now have been easily and safely abandoned. These facts aided much the onward movement in England: and though the Council of Trent was not closed, and its decrees not published, till after the completion of the Anglican Reformation; yet its progress was marked, and its proceedings commented on, by those great antagonists who were erecting the structure of Anglican ecclesiastical freedom. “Quos Jupiter vult perdere prius dementat,” is a pagan motto; but it would seem to have been fully exemplified in the case of the Roman divines whom we have instanced.

In the midst of these transactions arose two remarkable persons, who, the one directly, the other indirectly, gave a new turn to affairs in England, and who were, under God, the cause that our Reformation proceeded on different grounds from that on the continent. These two persons were Anna Bullen or Boleyn and Thomas Cranmer. No individuals have been more bespattered with abuse by one party, or more indiscriminately lauded by the other, than these two; and yet, if we consult simply the facts of history, and not the deductions of historians, there would seem to be no great difficulty in properly appreciating them. The one, if judged by her own letters, as well as by the events of her life, will appear to have been a clever, ambitious, fascinating, and not very scrupulous woman. It would be idle to suppose that Henry VIII., who, in truth, “rather than he would miss or want any part of his will, would endanger the half of his kingdom”—it would, we say, be idle to suppose that, with a character and with a position like his, he would *first* take steps to obtain his divorce, and *then* seek to secure the object of his new passion. The only supposition that common sense will allow us to make is, that having, as we know he did, heaped honours and favours upon her previous to sending away Catherine, he made her well acquainted with his further intentions respecting her—if, indeed, there did not pass any “*prælibatio matrimonii*” between them. At all events, she knew that her exaltation was to be purchased by the separation

from the king of a truly Christian woman and a most devoted wife. Her confidence in the power of her own fascinations must have been great; for if Henry made so small scruple, and succeeded so completely, in divorcing the daughter of a powerful monarch, and whose near relative, then king of Spain and emperor, was well able to avenge her—who was, moreover, for her many tried virtues, acceptable to the whole nation—she must have felt, and it appears did feel, how completely she was in the king's power, if she accepted his hand. That she favoured the Reformation, it is true, and by her adroit management, perhaps, drew the king forward many points more than he would have gone of his own accord; and this fact appears to have caused her Protestant canonization. Besides, though we do not attach any blame or ignorance to those who doubted the validity of Catherine's marriage, yet we cannot look upon it (considering the circumstances under which it took place, and that the previous marriage was merely a nominal one) as otherwise than lawful. At all events, we hold that the divorce was *unlawful*, and Anna, whatever she might think herself (and we cannot believe her free from doubts on the matter), neither more nor less than a crowned adulteress.

Turn we now to a character of a widely different stamp, one who, although he participated in the dark transaction of the king's divorce, and was, in consequence of such participation, raised to the highest dignities of the Church, appears yet to have been influenced by pure motives, for his opinion had been pronounced before he had any personal knowledge of the king. When they were made acquainted, it is evident that a very sincere, and indeed affectionate, friendship subsisted between them; and this friendship was uninterrupted, even by the bold stand that the archbishop occasionally made against the arbitrary decrees of his royal master. Cranmer was not perfect; but there were few greater and few better men of his time. The point of view, however, in which the queen and the archbishop should be viewed is, the one as the cause moving Henry VIII. to take up the Reformation, and the other as the principle regulating the mode in which he did so. The Lutheran Reformation was already at work, and had made many converts in England. Tyndal had preached its doctrines boldly, both at Cambridge and at Oxford, and had found favourable listeners. The Scriptures were being examined, and had no impulse been given by those in authority, the movement would doubtless have gathered strength, and gone on as it did on the continent; slower, indeed, and farther, because the corruption of the Church was far less, but still it would have made progress, and established itself in innumerable independent sections, having no apostolical succession

—no regular ministry—no certain sacraments : but God so over-ruled the fierce passions of a despotic king that the *Church*, as well as the people, was reformed, and all the blessings of an apostolical polity secured to the Establishment in these realms.

The remarkable candour and great experience of Cranmer made him a particularly valuable instrument in this work ; he saw at once that the Church required reformation, because her doctrines were become corrupt, her discipline lax, and because her priesthood had usurped powers which of right belonged to God only ; but he saw, at the same time, that there were, under all this mass of human invention, the true doctrines of the Gospel, and the true discipline of the Apostolic Church. His aim, therefore, was to separate, in both cases, the wheat from the chaff ; and he had, in the first place, only to aid the onward movement which was already begun. So strong was the opposition arising from the causes already mentioned—so many were the dignitaries, and so profound the learning, arrayed against the spread of the Lutheran doctrines—that they of necessity made but slow progress, compared with that made by them on the continent. But when the first steps had been taken, and some access given for the “*new doctrine*,” as it was wrongly called, to reach those qualified to judge of its character, every day diminished the opposition, and increased the strength of the movement. At first it was necessary to encourage the Reformers, even though they might push their ideas of reformation too far. Soon it became sufficient not to hinder them. Gradually a third period approached, when the excesses of the favourers of Lutheranism required a check—when the work was proceeding steadily in right channels, and was only retarded by injudicious advocacy. Cranmer had acted with great wisdom during the two former periods, and when the third arrived he was already provided with a colleague, admirably fitted for the crisis, in the person of Nicholas Ridley.

Cranmer had exercised an enlightened eclecticicism ; he knew well the state of the continental Protestants, and he selected from their various tenets whatever he found in accordance with the *ancient Church*, retaining, at the same time, all in the existing Establishment that would bear the same test. That a proceeding like this, however wise we may now perceive it to be, was highly displeasing to the excited minds of the foreign Protestants, is easy to be conceived. Accustomed as they were to behold the Roman Church under a much more unfavourable point of view than it was ever seen under in this country ; clogged with far more *Popery*, and governed by a notoriously worldly priesthood—with secular prince-bishops—with

lay cardinals—with the higher ecclesiastical dignities occupied by persons whose only claim to them was, for the most part, royal blood or political influence—with greater ignorance among the people, and a more unequal distribution of revenues in the Church—with a stern and determined opposition, on the part of the whole hierarchy, to *any* reformation—it is not to be wondered at that the foreign Protestants, despairing of doing any good with the Establishment under which they lived, should contract a distrust for Establishments in general, and an overgreat jealousy, which led them unhesitatingly to condemn whatsoever was adopted, or had been retained, by the Papists.

Again, the nature of their studies was, for the most part, of a different class from that pursued by the English Reformers. They studied the Scriptures, and, *comparatively*, the Scriptures alone. Their favourite researches had been made, not in the historical, but in the metaphysical part of Church antiquity; they were more familiar with Aristotle than with the fathers — with Thomas Aquinas and the schoolmen than with the discipline of the Apostolic Church. They were thus prepared to see the absurdities of Popery in a very clear light, for their intellects were sharpened; but they were not prepared to substitute any system for it, but what they had themselves concocted, by their own private judgment, from the Scriptures. We say this was comparatively the case; they did read the fathers, but not sufficiently, and there were among them men whose attainments were almost universal. Melancthon, one of the most able of men, was also one of the most profound of patristic scholars; and the writings of this eminent Reformer were, we find, most in accordance with those of our own bishops.

The subjects which occupied the public mind in England were, in the first place, the same as those which animated Luther and his colleagues; but when it became evident that the whole hierarchy might be turned into the reformed channel, and its vast power be made available for the real spiritual benefit of the country, then the question arose—what is wanting to bring the Anglican Church to a coincidence with that of the apostolic era and the age immediately succeeding? And this consideration, together with the peculiar circumstances of the country, tended to encourage a continually increasing search into ecclesiastical antiquity. The Papists might be contented with calling the Lutheran Reformers schismatics; and, *if* schism and separation be always the same thing, schismatics they certainly were. This was a difficult question to determine, and, in the mean time, the Papists had the advantage; but with regard to the Anglican Church the case was different. That Church had *not* separated, and it

remained for the Roman Church to prove that she had any authority to excommunicate, not to say an entire and independent branch of Christ's Church Catholic, but even *one* of its members: it remained to be shown what the power of the Pope really was—what was the nature of the apostolical succession, and how far the Papal authority concerned its validity, and the consequent validity of the sacraments—what constituted a Church—what things were essential thereto, and what only accidental—what might lawfully be omitted in cases of *necessity*, and what could *not* under *any* circumstances. All these questions could only be decided by an appeal to primitive antiquity; and when the Church of Rome urged the opinions of the school doctors, the Reformers appealed, as Isaac Taylor well observes (although in a bad book), to an antiquity still more ancient, and to a catholicity still more catholic. They referred to those who read the Epistles while (as the same writer beautifully remarks) the very ink of the apostolic autographs was scarcely dry.

It is, we believe, more to the different direction of their studies, than to the circumstances of the case, that the continental Reformation went on, in defiance of apostolical discipline, and that in this country in accordance therewith; for, had the reformed congregations on the continent desired it, they could, even during the reign of Henry VIII., have had canonically consecrated bishops. Who could doubt the willingness of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer to have conferred such consecration upon persons properly recommended to them for the purpose? The title would have involved no lordship—no dominion—no revenues—it would but have placed them in the position of the Anglo-American bishops of our own day, who were similarly consecrated; but the truth was, they were earnest only for doctrine, and careless about discipline. They were not aware of what, had they been diligent students of Church history, they would clearly have seen, viz., that there *cannot long be purity of DOCTRINE without apostolicity of DISCIPLINE*, and they were soon to experience the truth of this neglected aphorism.

Nearly contemporaneous with Ridley, arose in France a man whose name has now become historical. In 1509 was born John Calvin, and in 1536 he published his "Institutes." The haughty and ambitious character of the man, his learning and eloquence, his fervent zeal for the Reformation, soon made his influence felt; and it was not long before he established himself as a Protestant Pope at Geneva. Here he contrived the consistorial scheme of Church government, constituting himself perpetual President, and ruling the "Reformed Churches," as they were called, with a rod of iron. His doctrines, which were

borrowed from Augustine, he explained in a remarkably lucid manner, and his phraseology has gradually been adopted by all Presbyterians and Dissenters: even those who repudiate his theory of predestination, take his opinions and his peculiar phraseology (which was *not* that of the primitive Church) in other points; and, as might be expected, in many cases the acceptance of the doctrines soon followed the acceptance of the language. We have, in other places, shown that his personal influence in this country was never very perceptible, and that the seventeenth Article, and some others, which were supposed to favour his views, were drawn up with reference to other tenets; that, in truth, the earlier Reformers looked to *Germany* for aid in developing the *doctrines*, and to the *fathers* in developing the *discipline* of the Church. Yet some, who visited or were banished to the continent, imbibed the predestinarian theory, and among these was Grindall, successively Bishop of London, Archbishop of York, and then of Canterbury. Bradford and Hooper, too, were not without a tincture of the same doctrine; and it is probable that one of the greatest losses which the divinity of that period suffered, was the loss of Ridley's Treatise on Election, addressed to Bradford. Whitgift, again, entertained the same views, and they became more common in his age, and the one which succeeded him. But in that which preceded him there were only Bradford and Hooper among men of note who were predestinarians. This—viz., Calvinism—was the first disturbing force acting upon the Reformation. The Marian persecution had been a fierce onslaught, but when it passed away, the principles of the reformed remained the same, even though their number was diminished. Calvinism, however, acted from within: its theory is most plausible, it rests upon an apparent search into the Scriptures, but it is a search in which the investigator relies on his own metaphysical subtlety, and rejects the testimony of the united Church till the age of St. Augustine. It entails consequences which neutralize all appeal to antiquity, and brings with it a phraseology contradictory at once to the Anglican formularies and the doctrines of the apostolic era. There are few things which have had so injurious an effect on the condition of our Church as the adoption by the Evangelical *party* (we speak here advisedly, for there are, thank God, many truly Evangelical men who are not connected with the party)—we say, then, that few events have done more mischief than the adoption, by the Evangelical *party*, of the Genevan phraseology. It has, in the minds of many, become identified with true religion; and the individual who should say that he was “regenerated in his baptism, made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of

heaven," would be immediately set down as something very like a heathen, if not much worse, viz.—a Roman Catholic. How many, alas, are there of the clergy who would thus judge, and who deem the absolution to the sick popish, and yet have solemnly sworn that they give their hearty and unfeigned assent and consent to all that is written in the Book of Common Prayer. Let us put one more home question. How many clergymen are there of the Evangelical PARTY, *who, not being EVANGELICAL HIGH CHURCHMEN, can, in this particular, escape the guilt, the awful guilt of PERJURY!* Yet this has altogether arisen from the adoption of the Genevan phraseology.

Nor does the mischief stop here: it affords a handle to Dissenters; first, to accuse the clergy of inconsistency, and justly; secondly, to accuse the Church of unscripturalness. This last charge arises from the joint ignorance of themselves and their clerical antagonists of the Calvinistic persuasion; but *these latter cannot repel it*. The phraseology in question was introduced by the Puritans; it was suited to a presbyterian communion, but not to an apostolic one; and from them it has descended, as a religious heirloom, to the less pious, and less honest, as well as less learned Dissenters, of our own day.

It is worthy of note, that this style of writing and speaking is the one into which a person self-educated, and who had read the Scriptures with the light only of his own judgment to guide him, would naturally fall. It is the first seen and most obvious theory of divinity; we say it *is*, because the very phraseology necessarily involves a certain set of doctrines, without which it is altogether out of place. It is Pharisaic, for it evinces, and is intended to evince, a nonconformity to the world in outward and non-essential things; it is like the coat and the "plain language" of the Quaker—it savours altogether of a sect. It is, with reference to the apostolic theology, what the Ptolemaic is to the Newtonian system of astronomy. The peasant sees, with his own eyes, the sun go round the world; the philosopher, by years of toil, attains to a satisfactory evidence that the earth goes round the sun. And this will often be found to be the case in the mysteries of religion: the first and obvious theory which would suggest itself to the minds of men, is found, on more attentive observation, to be incorrect; and the truth to lie so deep, and to be so abstruse, that it requires the most acute and penetrating intellect to comprehend it. The *great practical* truths of our holy religion are so plainly revealed, that he who runs may read. Those truths, on the other hand, which make Christianity into one grand and glorious whole, having a relation to all worlds and all orders of existence, are in a great part un-

revealed; and what is given us to know, is given us in dark sayings—in partial and hasty glimpses of the eternal world—just enough to show us our own utter insufficiency, in this state of frailty and probation, to comprehend the awful attributes of the All-holy One of Israel.

But there is, on the other hand, a set of system makers, who confine themselves to the philosophy of the Christian dispensation, as a saving revelation to man, and developed in the apostolic writings. Of these we have had many in England, the chief of whom was Baxter. But our Reformers were not of this class: they accepted, indeed, and enforced the creed of St. Athanasius, because they really believed its premises correct—and in our judgment they acted rightly in so doing; yet because it is drawn up in a metaphysical style, and bears reference to certain dangerous metaphysical sophistries, not easily understood save by the learned, they confined its use to a few days in the year. With this exception, the Anglican Reformers allowed every man to make his own *philosophical system*, if he wanted one, out of the separate *doctrines they taught him*. Their reasons for this might be manifold. It is probable that they had no time for such a purpose; it is very likely that they shrunk from putting the truths of Christianity into a form which would render them incomprehensible to the poor, and unpalatable to those who had already, however incorrectly, formed a different system. Thus they taught the omniscience of God; they taught also the free will of man; and they made no attempt in their formularies, by introducing another article, to reconcile the *apparent* inconsistency between these two truths. Had they done this—and there were some among them, Ridley and Cranmer, at all events, who could have done it—they would at once have plunged to such a depth in metaphysical philosophy as to have alarmed ninety-nine out of a hundred of those who *attempted* to understand them. And here let us observe how exactly their writings were suited to the times. We turn over the volume of Ridley before us, and we find his treatise on Transubstantiation learned and logical: we find it filled with patristic quotations—for the dispute had awakened also the Papists to turn over the tomes of the fathers—most acute, and sometimes most severe, yet always calm and argumentative. His *argumenta ad absurdum* are splendid: take a specimen, which is worth all that Exeter Hall ever heard from the lips of all the itinerant orators, of all the Reformation Societies and Protestant Associations, that ever assembled there during the religious carnival:—

“Now, then, if you grant me that Paul did use the form of words

which he writeth, let us then rehearse and consider Paul's words, which he saith Christ spake thus upon the cup: 'This cup is the New Testament in my blood; this do, as often as ye shall drink it, in the remembrance of me.'

"Here I would know, whether that Christ's words, spoken upon the cup, were not as mighty in work, and as effectual in signification, to all intents, constructions, and purposes (as our Parliament men do speak), as they were when spoken upon the bread? If this be granted, which thing, I think, no man can deny, then further I reason thus: but the word ('is'), in the words spoken upon the Lord's bread, doth mightily signify, they say, the change of the substance of that which goeth before it into the substance of that which followeth after, that is, of the substance of Christ's body, when Christ saith, 'This is my body.' Now, then, if Christ's words, which be spoken upon the cup, which Paul here rehearseth, be of the same might and power, both in working and signifying, then must this word ('is'), when Christ saith, 'This cup is the New Testament,' &c., turn the substance of the cup into the substance of the New Testament. And if thou wilt say that this word ('is') neither maketh nor signifieth any such change of the cup, although it be said of Christ that this cup is the New Testament, yet Christ meant no such change as that: marry, Sir, even so say I, when Christ said of the bread which he took, and after thanks given, brake, and gave them, saying, 'Take, eat, this is my body,' he meant no more any such change of the substance of bread into the substance of his natural body, than he meant of *the change and transubstantiation of the cup into the substance of the New Testament.*"

The same characteristics of immense learning, great calmness, and acute logic, we find in his short treatise on Image Worship. Now let us turn to a work intended, not for the scholar, but for all devout persons—his "Piteous Lamentation." Here we have earnest eloquence, vehement, sometimes passionate appeals to the feelings, as well as to the conscience. Where shall we find, again, more exquisitely beautiful and pathetic language than in his celebrated Farewell? The following passage is perfect:—

"Farewell, therefore, Cambridge, my loving mother and tender nurse! If I should not acknowledge thy manifold benefits, yea, if I should not for thy benefits, at the least, love thee again, truly I were to be accounted ungrate and unkind. What benefits hadst thou ever, that thou usest to give and bestow upon thy best beloved children, that thou thoughtest too good for me? Thou didst bestow on me all thy school degrees: of thy common offices, the chaplainship of the university, the office of the proctorship, and of a common reader; and of thy private commodities and emoluments in colleges, what was it that thou madest me not partner of? First, to be scholar, then fellow, and after my departure from thee thou calledst me again to a mastership of a right worshipful college. I thank thee, my loving mother, for all this

thy kindness ; and I pray God that his laws, and the sincere Gospel of Christ, may ever be truly taught and faithfully learned in thee.

“ Farewell, Pembroke Hall, of late mine own college, my cure and my charge ! What case thou art in now, God knoweth—I know not well. Thou wast ever named sithens I knew thee (which is now a thirty years ago) to be studious, well learned, and a great setter forth of Christ’s gospel, and of God’s true word : so I found thee, and, blessed be God, so I left thee indeed. Woe is me for thee, mine own dear college, if ever thou suffer thyself by any means to be brought from that trade. In thy orchard (the walls, butts, and trees, if they could speak, would bear me witness), I learned without book almost all Paul’s Epistles, yea, and I ween, all the canonical Epistles, save only the Apocalypse. Of which study, although in time a great part did depart from me, yet the sweet smell thereof, I trust, I shall carry with me into heaven : for the profit thereof I think I have felt in all my lifetime ever after ; and I ween, of late (whether they abide there now or no, I cannot tell), there was that did the like. The Lord grant that this zeal and love toward that part of God’s word, which is a key and a true commentary to all holy Scripture, may ever abide in that college, so long as the world shall endure.”

The writings and actions of such a man make every information, as to his domestic habits, most interesting ; and we find in the volume before us, collected together, all that is known on the subject. Dr. Turner, Dean of Wells, wrote a letter to Fox about the character and expected good effects of the “ Acts and Monuments,” and in it speaks particularly of Ridley. This letter, which has hitherto only existed in MS. in the Harleian collection, is now printed and translated, together with a valuable “judicium” of Ridley’s, and one or two original letters. The Dean of Wells had been educated as a physician, and was a man of considerable learning, albeit his Latinity is certainly not of the very highest order ; his polemical writings are valuable, and will be edited by the Parker Society ; but there appears in this letter a narrowness of mind which we should hardly have expected in a scholar of that age. He was somewhat too much of a Protestant. But our present business is not with his apparent bias towards Puritanism, but with his information about Bishop Ridley, and we will let him speak for himself :—

“ As to his memory and manifold knowledge of arts and languages, though I might myself be an abundant witness (for he first instructed me in a fuller knowledge of the Greek language), yet, beyond my testimony, almost all Cambridge men, to whom he was well enough known, will and can bear witness to it. How strong he was in confuting or overthrowing any [false] argument, yet without any vain-glory or parade of his learning, not only I, but all those who met with him, sensibly perceived, unless indeed those who were, more than is meet,

eager for glory (for this he put down). In his manners he was most placid, and, without any hypocrisy or monastic severity, most holy; for very often he would exercise himself with me both with the bow and at quoits.

“Of his beneficence to the poor, if there were no other witness, I would willingly testify to all; for, before he had arrived at any ecclesiastical dignity, he would take me to the nearest (poor-house?), and when I had not wherewithal to give to the poor, he, in addition to what he largely distributed according to his own estate, would also supply me, that I also might bestow somewhat upon them.”

This is what we should have expected: the bow and the quoits show us the healthy state of the mind. The trees in the college orchard, that could (had they been able to speak) have borne witness to the Scripture readings, show us the healthy state of the soul; the charity to the poor, and the supplies that Turner might contribute in his own name, point out the healthy state of the affections. Let us take one other most interesting picture from the episcopal palace, to show how unchanged was his character even in his high office as Bishop of London. His kindness to the mother of Bonner stands out in splendid relief to the conduct of that sanguinary and unhappy prelate:—

“Now remaineth a word or two to be declared of his gentle nature and kindly pity in the usage of an old woman called Mistress Bonner, mother to Doctor Bonner, sometime Bishop of London: which I thought good to touch, as well for the rare clemency of Doctor Ridley, as the unworthy immanity and ungrateful disposition again of Doctor Bonner. Bishop Ridley being at his manor of Fulham, always sent for the said Mistress Bonner, dwelling in an house adjoining to his house, to dinner and supper, with one Mistress Mungey, Bonner’s sister, saying, ‘Go for my mother Bonner;’ who, coming, was ever placed in the chair at the table’s end, being so gently intreated, welcomed, and taken, as though he had been born of her own body, being never displaced of her seat, although the king’s council had been present, saying, when any of them were there (as divers times they were), ‘By your lordships’ favour, this place, of right and custom, is for my mother Bonner.’ But how well he was recompensed for this his singular gentleness and pitiful pity after, at the hands of the said Dr. Bonner, almost the least child that goeth by the ground can declare. For who afterward was more enemy to Ridley than Bonner and his? Who more went about to seek his destruction than he? recompensing his gentleness with extreme cruelty. As well appeared by the strait handling of Ridley’s own natural sister, and George Shipshide her husband, from time to time: whereas the gentleness of the other did suffer Bonner’s mother, sister, and other his kindred, not only quietly to enjoy all that which they had of Bonner, but also entertained them in his house, showing much courtesy and friendship daily unto them: whereas, on the other side, Bishop Bonner, being restored again, would not suffer the brother and natural sister of Bishop Ridley, and other

his friends, not only not to enjoy that which they had by the said their brother, Bishop Ridley, but also curiously, without all order of law or honesty, by extort power wrested from them all the livings they had."

If we look again to the closing scene, we shall see the same cheerful Christianity, the same high resolve, the same faith and hope, the same consideration for others, which had ever distinguished the Christian and Catholic bishop, now adorning and glorifying the Christian and Catholic martyr. Latimer, who suffered with him, was an older man, and an older labourer in the same vineyard; his fervour and zeal made him one of the most prominent characters in the work of reformation; while his purely Anglican education, and his subsequent intimacy with Cranmer and Ridley, preserved him from the errors of the continental Reformers.

We must now once more return to the reign of Henry VIII., in order to watch the proceedings of two persons, to whose good offices the progress of the Gospel owes much. We do not speak of Tyndal and Coverdale, though by translating the Scriptures they gave a mighty impulse to the work; for they properly belong to the earlier age of the Reformation, and coincide only chronologically with that of which we are now speaking; their sympathies were with the German Reformers: and when the changes in England began to assume that form in which we find the germ of our present pure and apostolic Church, Tyndal had suffered martyrdom, and Coverdale had well nigh retired from controversy. We allude to Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex, and Queen Catherine Parr. Cromwell has, like Anna Bullen, been canonized by the Protestants, because he favoured the Reformation, and because he was put to death by Henry VIII. It will be worth while, therefore, to weigh the services which he really performed in that work; nor can we do this without first estimating the character of the agent. That Cromwell has been much overrated, is now generally conceded; and a more accurate investigation of his life and motives has only tended to reduce his credit. To say that he sprung from the dregs of the people, is to say nothing against him, because though many species of *intrinsic* nobility are, to a certain extent, hereditary—and indeed physical and educational causes jointly may be shown to produce this effect—yet every family must have some great ancestor, and that great ancestor must have had some powerful qualities to raise him above the class among which he would otherwise have vegetated. Cromwell appears, however, to have been a mean-minded man, of great abilities, and great ambition: he suggested to the king the first idea of plundering the clergy; he taught the doctrine that the king had

the right to condemn to death without trial—a doctrine which was afterwards deservedly reduced to practice in his own case; he exercised his office of visitor-general to the monasteries without the least regard to either justice or humanity; he did his best to reduce the Church to the condition of a mere creature of the State—for, in fact, he was a thorough Erastian, and to his influence over the mind of Henry may we mainly attribute the present crippled resources of the Anglican Church. The mention of Thomas Cromwell brings us to the effects of the Reformation on the Establishment. It was taken up and patronized by two, or, more accurately speaking, by three, descriptions of persons. The first were those who saw the spiritual necessity of a change—who perceived the evils of Popery, and longed to sweep away the whole Roman system, with whatever belonged to it, good, bad, and indifferent—from the supremacy of the Pope and the doctrine of transubstantiation, down to the copes, and stoles, and surplices, and church music, and forms of prayer, and singing boys—from gothic cathedrals and lord bishops, down to sextons and bell-ringers: such were Hooper and Bradford, sincere but misguided men—Calvinists in doctrine, and Erastians in principle. The second class wished only so much to be “reformed away from the face of the earth,” as our transatlantic brethren say; or “dealt with,” as our Church commissioners phrase it; which was really unchristian, uncatholic, and modern: such were Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer. The third class were such as, from various causes, had imbibed a feeling of favour to the doctrines of the Reformation, but who were careless about discipline, and desirous to obtain temporal advantages by means of the religious movement: such were Cromwell, Somerset the Protector, and many others. Cromwell, indeed, declared, on the scaffold, that he died in the *Catholic faith*, by which it appears that he meant the *Romanist faith*—a profession which can, in his case, be explained on no imaginable principles of human nature. That wholesale robbery, commonly called the suppression of monasteries, which took place in 1535, was probably one of the most atrocious acts of despotism ever committed. In the first place, the property seized neither was nor ever had been the property of the State: it had been given by pious individuals for specific purposes. In all these cases the spirit of the donation or bequest was, that the property given or bequeathed was to be employed for the interest and spread of religion, according to the Anglican Church—the Anglican Church, because, previous to the Lutheran Reformation, and the separation effected by *Rome* between England and herself, no one in England ever thought or spoke of the *Roman*

Church as that established in England. While, therefore, the property given to Anglican Catholics for pious purposes in one age, might fairly be claimed by Anglican Catholics for pious uses in another, it is tolerably clear, we think, even to the meanest capacity, that to take that property by the strong arm, not of the law, but of lawless despotism, and to give it to the Russells and "other extraneous persons," was neither more nor less than, on the one side, of positive robbery, and on the other, of receiving stolen goods.

Let us suppose that no other change had taken place than making the monasteries colleges for education, such as those in our Universities, making the monks into fellows, and the novices into undergraduates, and obliging each monastery to provide for its own district sufficient church accommodation—in what state would the Establishment now be, both as regards churches and ministers? Can we, moreover, believe the monstrous tales, circulated by the visitors, of the immoralities practised in the monasteries and convents of England in the sixteenth century? Doubtless there were here and there some excesses; but, as a whole, the best authorities will give us to understand that they were not very extensive. We are well aware that many good men in our day are so ill-informed on this and many other subjects, that they will set us down for what they are pleased to call "Pusevites," for making an assertion like this; they are so blinded by prejudice that they can see no medium between Innocent III. and John Knox—between Bellarmine and Calvin—between Alexander VI. and Martin Mar-prelate. We, however, speak to EVANGELICAL HIGH CHURCHMEN, and we feel that we can only condemn, and that in the strongest terms, the confiscation of Church property which signalized the English Reformation. We find no opinion on this topic expressly given in any of Ridley's writings; but we do find him insolently rebuked by Somerset for "barking" too loudly at Cambridge. We do not hesitate to express our belief that the very great laxity of discipline and ignorance of Church authority, the spread of false doctrine, heresy, and schism, which has distinguished these later times, and the variety of opinion which has, alas, prevailed among the clergy, as well as among the laity, are all the visitations of God's judgment upon us, as a nation, for that spoliation and robbery upon which the Ecclesiastical Reformation was founded, and that secularity of spirit which characterized the then *temporal* heads of the Church. Cromwell, innocent though he was towards Henry, yet richly merited his death for his treachery to the Church; and he may justly be said to have laid the foundation of that system, which, under a later and a

bolder Cromwell, overthrew the Church altogether. If it be true that Henry VIII. destroyed the idols of silver and gold, and Sir Harry Vane those of wood and stone, it is no less true that the tyranny and lawlessness of the one paved the way for the barbarism and fanaticism of the other; and the Reformation, considered as a *state act*, is a transaction which only differed from the great Rebellion in the permanency of its institutions. In each case were vested rights violated; in each case was a secular and selfish desire of aggrandizement masked under a pretended desire for God's glory; in each case were the ambitious schemes of rulers made the means of introducing religious changes; and in each case was Church property unhesitatingly confiscated, and applied to state purposes. It is true that in the one case the form and government of an Apostolic Church were preserved, and in the latter sacrificed; but that the Anglican Church retained her catholicity under Edward VI. is to be attributed, not to statesmen, but to divines—not to Protestant ministers, but to Catholic prelates—not to Northumberland and Somerset, but to CRANMER and RIDLEY. Even in our own days it is proved that the nation which sowed the wind is to reap the whirlwind; and we have seen ten bishoprics cut off at a stroke from the Reformed Church of Ireland, and canonries innumerable from our own; and we have seen an attempt made, which was only frustrated by the united voice of the clergy, to suppress the venerable see of Sodor and Man. And to what purposes are the suppressed revenues in Ireland to be applied?—to the building of churches?—to the endowment of poor livings?—to the sending of reformed clergymen among the benighted Papist districts? Alas! no: but for educational purposes; not for educating the poor in the principles of an Apostolic Church—in obedience to constituted authorities—in the virtues and duties which would make them respectable men and useful citizens—but in a godless, purely secular, and irreligious education. Thus has God made our sin, not merely the means, but the instrument, of our punishment; and unless we return to our duty, as Christian citizens, can we expect him to stay his hand?

Our sin was a political sin. The *bishops, priests, and deacons* acted well in the time of the English Herod; they purified the doctrines and restored the discipline of the Church, till they made her as near in both to the apostolic model as could be expected. But it was the *princes and governors*, who, instead of being nursing fathers to the Church, were ravening wolves; it was the *rulers, unlawful rulers* though they were, that, in the time of the great Rebellion, overthrew the whole framework of our ecclesiastical constitution; and it was the *Whig Govern-*

ment who so lately made their first attack on the Establishment on the side of Ireland. We well know that *now* the bishops, priests, and deacons, are willing to contribute, up to their means, and beyond their means, to the extension of our Church ; they are endeavouring, even now, to make up, in some small degree, by their private liberality, the deficiency occasioned by so many State robberies. Truly the connection of Church and State has been a connection of spoliation on one part, and submission on the other ; and yet Dissenters are ever prating about a State Church and State patronage ! But let us go onward.

It was the rulers and princes, who, after the Revolution, introduced so complete a spirit of Erastianism into the Church, that, for nearly a century, she sunk into a state of slumber, forgot her high office, and allowed the whole land to be overrun with schism and heterodoxy. Now, indeed, she is awakened from her lethargy, and is nobly, though with crippled means, combating the powers of evil ; and now, therefore, we call on the rulers of our land, if they wish to merit the name of Christian rulers, to atone for the sins of their predecessors in office. If they cannot repair all the injuries that successive evil governments have inflicted, or restore all that they have unrighteously seized, let them, at all events, do what they can—make such provision for the perishing multitudes of souls as is yet within their power. Magnificent is the language of La Martine :—

“Peuple ! des crimes de tes pères,
Le Ciel punissant tes enfans,
De chatiments hereditaires
Accablera tes descendans !”

We add a recent translation :—

“Nation ! Heaven frowns upon thy path,
In vengeance for thy fathers' crimes,
And with hereditary wrath
Shall whelm thy sons in future times !”

There are too many frightful examples unrolled on the pages of history for us to neglect any warning ; therefore let every Churchman, more especially every man who ministers at the altar, lift up his prayer to Almighty God, that He, who turneth the hearts of kings according to his godly wisdom, may turn the hearts of our rulers to “repair the breaches of Zion.” The mention of Cromwell has led us into a long digression.

We spoke of another person, who, during the latter years of Henry VIII., exercised a great and wholesome influence over the mind of the now irritable and ferocious monarch : this person was Queen Catherine Parr. She was attached, from principle, to the reformed faith ; she had been well educated, and

was skilled in controversial divinity; her influence, though sometimes a little shaken, increased with time, and she exercised it in the most blameless manner, viz., in recommending for preferment such persons as she patronized herself—men of virtue and learning.

A review of all the circumstances attending the Reformation will tend to convince us that the chief character concerned in it was Ridley: and as we look upon him as being the element of catholicity, conjointly with Cranmer, we are the more rejoiced at seeing his works now for the first time collected together. The letters which have not been before published are few: we find one only of Ridley himself, and one of his faithful and attached attendant, Augustine Bernher, and one "*judicium de epistolis decretalibus*"—of which last is subjoined a translation: this was found among the MSS. in the library of Emanuel College, Cambridge, a library particularly rich in relics of this kind, and where also are many unpublished letters of Bradford. We here, too, wish to make a remark involving the credibility of Fox. It appears, by the history of Ridley's examination or disputation at Oxford, that Jewel, afterwards the celebrated Bishop of Salisbury, was then and there present, in the capacity of a notary, and that he took down the whole of the disputation, as it took place, viz., in Latin. Now this very disputation is preserved, in MS., in the Parker MSS., in the library of Corpus Christi College, at Cambridge, and is printed in Fox's Latin work, "*Rerum in Ecclesiâ Gestarum Commentarii*," without much disagreement. On the other hand, there are considerable variations from the Latin MSS. and printed book to be noted in Fox's English account of the disputation. Now the question arises, whether the MS. preserved by Archbishop Parker, and with which the text of Fox's "*Rerum Gestarum Liber*," so far as it goes, agrees, is not the identical work of Jewel. In the first place, Fox must have got his account from *some* sources; and, since a correct account did exist, it would seem highly probable that, either directly or indirectly, he would have obtained access to it. This opinion derives considerable confirmation from the fact of the agreement between the Parker MS. and the printed book of Fox. Nor is it at all affected by the occasional variations in the English of Fox, for the martyrologist took huge liberties with the authors he translated; and, provided he attained what *he* considered the spirit, he troubled himself very little about the letter. Actuated by a belief that the Latin thus preserved might be really the disputation preserved by Jewel, it is, we rejoice to see, republished by the Editor, as an Appendix.

The Parker Society, so called from the archbishop of that name, contemplates republishing (or publishing, as the case may be) all the principal divinity of the Reformed Anglican Church during the sixteenth century. The scheme is a most extensive one, and will, we are persuaded, be productive of extensive good. The reader, unused to peruse the kind of publication thus presented to him, will be astonished to see such a variety of opinions prevailing among those whom he perhaps has imagined all acting in concert: he will find one writer maintaining Calvinistic views, and another denying them—one asserting that the Church is visible, and another that she is invisible—one maintaining that the Church preserves the apostolical succession, and another that, as a succession of persons, there was no such thing. Something will be gained to the cause of truth by merely impressing on the public mind the fact, that the *religious* Reformation was carried on, independently, by separate individuals, all varying in rank, station, ability, learning, and influence, one from another, and agreeing only in the one principle, that the Roman Church was decidedly in the wrong, and that **POPERY** *was* **ANTICHRIST**. Thus far they all agreed: but what was **POPERY**? “Not the Church of Rome (say some), but only the corruptions of that Church—the supremacy of her chief pastor, the unscriptural claims of her priesthood, her false doctrine and lax discipline.” All these are Popery, because they are a subtle amalgamation of a worldly spirit with pretended religion—because they make it *possible* for a man to serve at once God and mammon, which the Scriptures declare to be *impossible*. Others, again, said that the Church of Rome was Antichrist, and that therefore everything connected with her had the mark of the beast, and that the further from Rome the better. Hence we find Hooper accepting, at one time, the office and revenues of two bishoprics, but scrupling to wear a square cap and episcopal robes, on the ground of Popery! Let it not be thought that we wish to throw a slur on the sincerity and piety of Bishop Hooper. Not only did he labour abundantly and successfully in the Lord—not only did he bestow largely out of his revenues on the necessitous—but he “gave his body to be burned,” and suffered with inflexible constancy. We wish merely to show how the prejudices of an undoubtedly good man led him to object to a mere trifle, and to consent at the same time to one of the greatest abuses of genuine Popery. Hence we may expect to observe great diversity among the earlier writers: but as we go forward, and enter on the Elizabethan era, we shall find a greater uniformity prevail; the only point of difference will be Calvinism, modified by the influence

of previous divines on the education of those who followed. This will be seen by comparing Hooper and Whitgift—Bradford and Grindall: the Calvinism in the latter cases being doctrinal only, the questions of discipline being already settled; while in the former it was accompanied by a leaning to the Genevan scheme of ecclesiastical polity. Another point on which differences obtained at first was private judgment. The first reformed bishops were so fully impressed with the spirit of their age that they were willing to employ the axe and the faggot as instruments of conversion. We find more than one person suffering death, and many suffering imprisonment and torture, on account of their religious opinions, even in what we call Protestant times. The truth is, there was very little toleration among any parties at that period; and Calvin, when he committed Servetus to the flames, was by no means condemned, save by those who agreed with Servetus in opinion, and therefore accounted him a martyr. Civil and *religious* liberty are thus commented on by the Editor of the “Tracts of the Anglican Fathers:”—

“There is no subject upon which more nonsense has been talked than what has been called ‘religious liberty.’ Those who make speeches at hustings, and after political dinners, in favour of what they are pleased to denominate ‘civil and *religious* liberty,’ mean invariably civil and *ecclesiastical* liberty. There is but one kind of religious liberty, which is ‘the glorious *liberty* of the children of God.’ All that the before-mentioned declaimers mean is, liberty to connect themselves with any sect, or with no sect, just as they please, without any temporal interference from ecclesiastical courts or persons. Now *this species* of religious, *i. e.*, ecclesiastical liberty flourishes in England; or, if the objector names tithes and church-rates, we will not dispute with him, however ignorant or however dishonest we may feel his objection to be; we will meet him on his own ground, and go with him to his own *El Dorado*.

“In the United States of America, then, ecclesiastical liberty may surely be said to prevail. Yet the Anglo-American Church assures the enquirer, after reciting to him the Creed of St. Athanasius, ‘This is the Catholic faith, which if a man keep not whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.’ Every sect of *orthodox*! Dissenters will give him, in varied ways, their damnatory clauses; and even there he will find none but the Socinian who will tell him that he may believe, with spiritual safety, as much or as little as he pleases. The right of private judgment, then, is a purely *civil* right; and, in a *spiritual* sense, neither is now nor ever was acknowledged by any body of Christian men. Each Church, and each body of schismatics, say the same thing in this respect: ‘We cannot compel you to profess, much less to believe, our tenets; but if you do not believe *the truth* you will be damned.’ We do not deny that a greater or a less latitude is given by these various bodies on points which they

deem non-essential ; but all have their essentials, on which they allow no latitude at all, or, in other words, no right of private judgment. We now, therefore, return to the proposition from which we set out ; but we have cleared it of some preliminary difficulties, and shall probably be able to see at once, that the Church must, by the very fact of her existence, be possessed of some powers, and that the right of admitting new members, and expelling faulty ones, is one of the powers which she does possess. We apprehend that none will deny this, save those who at the same time deny the existence of a Church at all. And here we have with us nearly all who *call* themselves Christians, and who *all* speak of *Church membership*, however they define it, as a *duty* as well as a *privilege*."

Nor was there any other idea of religious liberty, in the days of the Reformers, than a perfect liberty to believe whatever was decided upon in convocation. We find so many persons taught to look upon all the Protestant martyrs as absolutely perfect, and all their opponents so very diabolical that few dare speak a word for a Marian Romanist : yet let us venture to rescue, from some of the obloquy which has been thrown upon him, the memory of Stephen Gardiner. That he was a worldly-minded man, we do not deny ; that he was a persecutor, we acknowledge ; but he was a persecutor from circumstances, rather than from choice, and would, we doubt not, have been heartily glad if the Marian persecution had never taken place. He was a man of immense talent and great erudition ; *his* weapon was the pen, and so skilfully did he use it that it required a Ridley to oppose him with effect. Nor can he fairly be charged with inconsistency in first supporting and then opposing the Reformation, for he supported it only to a certain point : he was rather a free-thinking Romanist : he had little belief in any of the mummeries that he beheld, and he cared not how soon they were overthrown ; but his opinions as to transubstantiation, the seven sacraments, and some other important points of doctrine, were unaltered ; and directly the onward stream of the Reformation reached these essential articles of his belief, he conscientiously opposed its further progress : nor did he do this without persecution—he remained for years in prison, rather than yield up to his oppressors what he believed to be the cause of truth. He has chiefly suffered on account of his office under Mary, and to whom he is said to have suggested the idea of exterminating the Protestants ; but it is highly probable that Mary's own feelings, which were extremely vindictive on this point, for she never forgot or forgave her mother's wrongs, overcame his will, as they did that of the amiable Reginald Pole : and that Gardiner then chose to direct the storm he could not control and suppress. Certain it is that never was any greater injustice

done to a man than is committed in coupling together Gardiner and Bonner, in all the unhappy events of that deplorable reign.

Bonner was, perhaps, one of the most unmitigated savages that ever was placed in authority. It must be acknowledged that he was devoid neither of ability nor learning—in the canon law he was particularly skilled; but his fierce demeanour, his brutal temper, his gross life, and utter carelessness both of human feeling and clerical decency, have handed him down to the execrations of posterity as a monster in human shape: and it is very probable that the acts and character of Bonner did more to promote the cause of the Reformation in England than the preaching of most of those persons who lost their lives under his rule. With such a man as this, Stephen Gardiner had nothing in common.

But we must, though unwillingly, quit a favourite field of discussion, and shall conclude this paper by a few remarks on the influence exerted by the Swiss and German Reformers here and in their own country. Calvin actually proposed, to all the reformed communions in Europe, to call together a synod, to consider the possibility of establishing something like an uniformity of worship; but, as his known object was that the uniformity should be a Genevan uniformity, Elizabeth instructed him that the English Church would retain her episcopacy; and his scheme dropped. At various times, attempts have been made to Calvinize doctrinally the Church in this country; and the nine assertions orthodoxal drawn up at Lambeth are important, because they show that, in the judgment of Calvinistic divines, she was not so at that time. The influence then exercised here by the letters and writings of the great French Reformer have been confined to individuals, and have never been carried out in the formularies of the Church. Our episcopacy has preserved a regularity of government and a perpetuity of doctrine, which we look for in vain in any communion not apostolically constituted. The presbyterian form of Church government, which gives a large power to the laity in spiritual matters, tends, of course, to encourage great liberty in interpretation; and it is very natural to suppose, that he who is to sit in judgment on a priest, is also qualified to sit in judgment on a creed; for he obviously has as much apostolical authority over one as over the other. Gradually have the evil effects of this spiritual republicanism displayed themselves, in the deterioration of doctrine; and the greater part of the reformed communities on the continent are cankered by Socinianism or Neology. We would earnestly exhort all those who have any doubts on the *necessity*—we do not say the expediency—of episcopacy, to turn to our

late articles on "The State of Protestantism in France," and "The Continental Reformation." Presbyterianism and Episcopacy are now fairly in comparison in Scotland, and it may there be seen that the one contains within itself the seeds of its own dissolution. The principle of religious republicanism is now, under the form of the veto question, agitating the Scottish Establishment to its foundation; while unestablished, unendowed episcopacy, though old as Christianity itself, is making steady and rapid progress. It is adapted to all times—accommodates itself to all circumstances. It flourishes in imperial England, and would, were the British Government to do its duty, prove the salvation of the country: may it, by God's blessing, be permitted to be. It flourishes in republican America, and may be, probably is, the salt that preserves that government from utter corruption. It flourishes in presbyterian Scotland, and will ere long be the chief form of religion there. Established or non-established (*that* question concerns the *country* only, not the *Church*), endowed or not endowed, encouraged or persecuted, it prospers alike, and will do so; for it is the form of polity established in the Apostolic Church, and that Church is built upon the Rock, even Christ, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

ART. II.—*Patchwork*. By Captain BASIL HALL, R.N., F.R.S.
3 vols. London: Moxon. 1841.

WHEN that distinguished scholar and admirable divine, George Stanley Faber, published his elaborate work, "The Mysteries of the Cabiri," the circulating library keepers, their magnanimous cogitations doubtless occupied with "The Mysteries of Udolpho," and dreaming of nothing short of a tremendous German castle, with trap-doors, banditti, and ghosts to match, at the hands of the reverend controversialist, ordered the work forthwith in great numbers, and never discovered their mistake, till the universal sisterhood of the Ladies' Languish returned the book with a simultaneous burst of indignation. The work of Captain Hall before us will occasion no such mistake; though the title seems to have cost him much pains, and is certainly, to our taste, the worst thing in the book. Why did he not stick to his old title, "Fragments?"—a far better one than the present.

The book is compounded chiefly of scenes laid in Italy and Sicily, and possesses the no mean merit of remarkable freshness and originality of detail. Sicily, from its insular situation, and the expense and uncertainty of conveyance thither, is, doubt-

less, comparatively untrodden ground; but to write something now-a-days which shall be more than a mere hand-book for Italy, sliced up, carved up, fricasseed, and olla-podridaed, as it has been, is what an author may well consider an achievement.

Captain Hall is at home everywhere; never so much so, like a true born Scot as he is, as when he is abroad. Whether scrambling up Mount Vesuvius, flirting at St. Gervais, hunting a recreant knight of the thimble through the back lanes of Paris, or soliloquizing over the fate of a demolished pasty in a precipitous pass, he is always so thoroughly and happily graphical amidst his travels, his troubles, his merriments, and his miseries, that he never fails of carrying the sympathies of his readers along with him. But, with all his enlivening humour, he is no literary mountebank. No one knows better how to be grave as well as gay. Some of the essays in his entertaining work are rich in matter of most serious import: and the admirable chapter on Improvements in Navigation and Seamanship furnishes forth ample proof, that, though latterly somewhat laid on the shelf, as regards command, he is still, like the Duke of York's marine, "an honest fellow, who has done his duty, and is able and willing to do it again."

But we must hasten to pick out some of the "patches" from his embroidered handiwork, that we may present our readers with them, by way of sample. One of the first that strikes our eye is from the chapter headed an "An Alpine Debaclé." A mountain torrent, long pent up in a deep and narrow gorge by ice-rocks and avalanches, had formed a lake, which, in time, swelled to half a league in length; and, though only three or four hundred feet wide, measured more than a hundred feet deep. There was danger that the weight of the accumulated waters would, ere long, prove too great for the strength of the dam of ice, and that the whole reservoir would be consequently dashed down the ravine, to the destruction of all the villages, fields, bridges, and mills, which lined the stream below. The attempt to get rid of the danger was both interesting and ingenious:—

"An able engineer, of the name of Venetz, who lived in the Valais, not far from Martigny, at once perceived that, although the evil might not, perhaps, be entirely averted, it might be essentially lessened. He saw clearly that it was impossible to diminish the magnitude of the lake formed by the glacier of Getroz, but he thought it might be prevented from rising above a certain level, if a gallery, or tunnel, could be cut through the barrier of ice at such a height *above the level of the lake* as would enable the work to be finished before the water should rise to that point. This required not only a very nice calculation, but a degree

of vigour and activity in the execution which it might be difficult to match in any other country. The drift or gallery which M. Venetz proposed to bore through the glacier, for the purpose of acting as a waste weir to the lake, was made to slope downwards, in such a way, that, when the water rose to its upper end, it should flow so rapidly through that it might act like a saw, and, by cutting down the height of the glacier, permit the lake gradually to descend till it was nearly emptied, and the mass of water be prevented from becoming an overmatch for the retaining wall of ice and snow, as it was certain to prove, sooner or later, if things were left alone.

“ ‘ This ingenious and bold scheme (to use the words of M. Escher de la Linth) was begun on the 10th of May, and finished on the 13th of June, under the direction of M. Venetz. The gallery was sixty-eight feet long, and during its formation the workmen were exposed to the constant risk of being crushed to pieces by the falling blocks of ice, or buried under the glacier itself.’* In the mean time the surface of the lake had risen sixty-two feet, but as it had not yet reached the upper orifice of the gallery, M. Venetz, with the same decisive spirit which marked all his proceedings on this critical occasion, having secured the main point, viz., a thorough opening across the barrier, set to work to cut down the floor of his gallery till it met the rising waters, which, glad of so free an outlet, flowed rapidly along the passage which the engineer had cut through the heart of the glacier.” (Vol. i., pp. 28, 29).

The depth of the lake at this juncture was two hundred feet; but by the 16th of June, or only three days after the sapping process had commenced working, the diminution in the height of the surface was forty-five feet, and all promised well for success; but, alas! the cascade undermined the dam, by washing away the loose materials forming the bed of the stream; the ice gave way with a tremendous crash, the lake was emptied in half an hour, and the sea of water which it contained rushed down with indescribable fury upon the devoted valley. Some idea may be formed of the devastation created by this terrible *debacle*, when it is stated that, where checked by the gorge below the glacier formed between Mont Pleureur and a projecting breast of Mont Mauvoisin, it carried away the bridge, ninety feet above the ordinary level of the stream, and even rose several fathoms above the advanced mass of the mountain. At one point the intervention of the village church saved a considerable district of houses from destruction:—

“ Had the side or end of the church faced the stream, it is supposed that not only it must have given way, but, in its train, all that quarter of the village would have been overwhelmed. The strong nature of the angle of the church, however, seems to have divided the waters; and as the valley at this point begins to spread itself out, the stream

* “ Edinburgh Phil. Journal,” vol. i., p. 189.

readily obeyed the new direction given to it, and flowed to the right and left. With some difficulty we made our way into the church, which was nearly half full of sand, mud, and stones, brought there by the flood. The pulpit just peeped above the mass of rubbish, but the altar was no longer visible, being quite buried under the mud. This very substantial building, indeed, had acted its part so firmly in the hour of need, that the old man who acted as our guide patted the wall familiarly with his hand, saying, 'The church was, and is, after all, our chief reliance in the hour of danger!'—something figurative, perhaps, mingling with the poetical sentiment." (Vol. i., p. 32, 33).

We opine that he must have been a sound Churchman and a good Conservative—that old gentleman.

Few people have a proper notion of the enormous extent of these Alpine glaciers. The accomplished Mons. Ebel says, "There may be at least four hundred in number, ranging from three or four to between twenty and thirty miles in length. Their depth is from one to seven hundred feet, and it is computed that the aggregate area which they occupy cannot be taken at less than twelve hundred square miles." Pretty good-sized icicles, truly! Few persons, even of those who have visited them, always excepting scientific people, are aware that these wonderful masses travel bodily forward every summer a distance varying from fourteen to twenty-five feet. The simple causes of this progression are very well described by our author: they are, in fact, just the same as those which gradually detach a mass of snow from the roof of a house in a thaw. Most of us probably can remember, at some time or other, having seen persons ridiculously enough overwhelmed for a moment by such mimic avalanches where there were no copings to the houses, and the snow was allowed to lie.

Some of Captain Hall's "patches," the colour and style of which have pleased us most, are of the Gothic pattern—order, ecclesiastical. And, indeed, to drop the metaphor suggested by his title-page, we may remark, with much pleasure, how constantly in his writings he keeps in view the advancement of religion, and the welfare of the Church: two things which are, or ought to be indeed, always synonymous.

We have before now adverted to the interest which he has taken in the cause of religion afloat. Here we have a specimen of the carrying out of the same feeling as regards the continent. And we may remark, moreover, by the way, that our gallant author is not ashamed to intimate, in various parts of his work, that in places where he and his family were precluded from attendance upon public worship, the duties and services of the sacred day of rest were regularly entered into around the family

altar. This may seem but small praise ; and, properly speaking, it is not, and ought not to be, any : but when so many English travellers are apt to forget on the continent their father's Church and their father's God—are content to fall in with the Sabbath-breaking levities, and general godless indifference, which so awfully and so lamentably prevails there, it cannot fail of calling forth our warmest commendation, that one like Captain Hall, well known as a traveller and a man of the world, should make this public confession—for we cannot take it at less—that he is not ashamed of Christ and of his Gospel. He bears, moreover, the gratifying testimony that the practical influence of Protestant chapels abroad, in communion with the Church of England, in reclaiming the wandering, steadying the wavering, and confirming the well-disposed, has been much greater than persons could believe, unless they had lived for some time on the continent.

We owe the establishment of the English chapel at Geneva, in 1814, to the present eminent and esteemed Bishop of Winchester, then the Rev. Charles Richard Sumner, who, observing a number of his countrymen scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd, officiated amongst them for a considerable time gratuitously. Ever since the year 1815, in consequence of a memorial addressed to the council of state, the British residents have enjoyed the free use of the hospital chapel for their Sunday worship. After two or three changes, Mr. Burgess, now Rector of Upper Chelsea, was elected to the chaplaincy, for the support of which about ten pounds a month had been raised. The duties at times devolved upon the Rev. John Hartley, and “it was in this capacity (says Mr. Burgess) that he attended the synod of pastors assembled to celebrate the third centenary of the Reformation, and there protested against the errors of the Genevese Church, charging its ministers with having abandoned the great doctrines of the Trinity, the Atonement, and the agency of the Holy Spirit. This bold attack upon the Genevan clergy was hailed with joy by many clergymen in England ; but it had such an effect upon the Genevese themselves as to prevent Mr. Hartley from again becoming the officiating chaplain at that place.” (Vol. i., p. 213).

This attack upon the Genevese errors was a very delicate point to determine upon. At Rome, such a course would, most probably, have at once given a death-blow to the interests of the Protestant chapel : it would have been a mere piece of foolhardy rashness, with scarce the possibility of the slightest resulting benefit. In Geneva, however, we think that Mr. Hartley acted wisely and well. At any rate, we are informed by Mr. Burgess that there can be no doubt that the standard of

sound doctrine constantly held up by the Church of England chapel there, must be reckoned among the causes of a revival of the orthodox faith which has taken place in that city.

The astonishing success of the English chapel at Rome is almost entirely due to the reverend gentleman whom we have just had occasion to quote. After having laboured for years in Geneva, it became his privilege to preach the Gospel "to them that were in Rome also."

"The existence of a Protestant chapel at Rome (says Mr. Burgess), where the service of the Church of England is regularly performed during six months of the year, is of itself a circumstance worthy of attention; for whether it be viewed as a striking instance of religious toleration, coming in an unexpected direction, or as the means of softening those prejudices which the comprehensive term of heretic conveys to the vulgar, it cannot fail to be an object of interest to every one who espouses the cause of civil and religious liberty. The institution is already known to a considerable number of British subjects, who will know how to appreciate the concession which prepared for them the privilege of joining in the public worship of the Church of England at Rome; but it is far from being generally understood that such an act of liberality has proceeded from the councils of the Vatican! The English chapel may now be considered as having the sanction of the Papal government, although no official grant has yet been made which would even acknowledge its existence." (Vol. i., pp. 217, 218).

At first (1816-17) the service was only conducted in a private room, near the column of Trajan: and thus began the service of the Reformed Church of England in the "eternal city!" In 1822 Mr. Burgess was first associated with that estimable individual, the late Rev. Joseph Cooke, Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, in endeavouring to promote the welfare of the true Church there. After much opposition and various changes, the congregation was at length settled, certainly with the tacit consent of the Papal government, in a spot near the Porta del Popolo, "which had been originally a large granary, but where the congregation every Sunday now amounts to six hundred and fifty or seven hundred persons." We have every reason to know, moreover, that the attendance is steady, even amongst the numerous pageantries and gorgeous displays with which Rome so largely abounds. Though the Pope was tolerantly disposed, either as a matter of expediency or necessity, towards the English congregation, neither he nor the Propaganda had much love for Mr. Burgess. This gentleman used, humorously enough, to affirm that he could beat his Holiness at everything, except making a nun. Whenever other festivities were going on, he could keep his congregation steady to his chapel; but

when an unfortunate novice was to take the veil, the attraction proved too strong for them, and off they all marched to St. Peter's. In addition to more serious difficulties with which Mr. Burgess had to contend, there occurred, from time to time, others of a less grave character:—

“One Saturday evening the custode or keeper of the English chapel came to announce to Mr. Burgess, with great dismay, that the portion of the building just beneath the chapel had been hired for a show of wild beasts, and that already the pictures were suspended upon the outer walls, and the next day (Sunday) the chapel staircase leading to the apartment was to be used for the access to the menagerie. The truth was ascertained, and measures were immediately taken to get this scandal stopped, at least, for the Sunday; but the ‘Pidcock’ of Rome alleged that he had got the governor's permission, had been all the week fitting up the room at a great expense, and he refused to move. By dint of persuasion, the exhibition was suspended for the Sunday, the pictures remaining unrolled on the walls, and the clergyman being allowed to proceed with no other interruption than the occasional roaring of the ‘royal beast’ below.

“The placard, announcing that *un gran leone* was to be seen ‘fuori della Porta del Popolo,’ was immediately torn down by the police, as offering too great a temptation to the Roman people, who delight in a bit of satire at the authorities, to pasquinade the real Leone XII., the reigning pontiff!

“The committee assembled on the following day, and applied to the governor of Rome and the secretary of state; but it was not until the committee consented to pay one hundred and fifty scudi, for a recompense to the man of beasts for his loss, that he was transferred over the way to a little less objectionable position. The government authorities said they were not aware that the room was so near the English congregation when they gave permission; but surely they ought not to have recompensed the proprietor at the expense of the English, in consequence of their own mistake. In about a fortnight the grand *leone* died, and the proprietor gravely applied to the chaplain, on Sunday morning, just before church, to request that the sum of half a scudo a head might be collected from the English congregation that day to recompense him for his loss! The ground he took was that the lion had died on account of being so long shut up during his litigation with the heretical committee! The chaplain expressed his wonder how the proprietor could ask such a thing, after having so insulted a congregation of worshippers; upon which he became very irate, and said that he now saw the egregious error into which the English had been led. They had taken him, it would seem, for a common showman (‘meneur d'ours,’ or bear-leader), with a drum and trumpet at the door, and a man to bawl out, ‘Walk up! walk up!’ whereas he was ‘purveyor of wild beasts to the Emperor of all the Russias’—‘fournisseur de l'Empereur’—and never had a man at his door to say so much as ‘C'est ici!’” (Vol. i., pp. 242-244).

Our author concludes his first volume with a notice of the English Protestant chapels in Tuscany, Sardinia, and France:—

“In Tuscany, where the toleration is ample, and does honour to the government, there are no less than four, viz., at Florence, Leghorn, Pisa, and Lucca Baths. Those at Pisa and Lucca Baths, however, may be considered as forming but one chaplaincy, as the English reside only half the year at each place. At Leghorn, as recently as the 28th May, 1840, a new church was opened for divine service according to the rites of the Church of England. This is, I believe, the first Protestant edifice that has ever been reared in Italy expressly for public worship. Permission has also been obtained for erecting a chapel at Pisa, as soon as funds can be raised for the purpose; a piece of ground has already been purchased for 260*l.*, the whole of which has been raised among the English residents. At Lucca Baths a chapel is rapidly proceeding, and is to be finished by the end of next May. The Grand Duke of Lucca, as well as the Grand Duke of Tuscany, have given the English the assurance of their special protection.” (Vol. i., pp. 255, 256).

It was his wish, Captain Hall observes, to have added a short sketch of the English chapels in other parts of the continent, and particularly in France. We should have been glad if he had done so, since such a notice from his pen could not fail of proving both valuable and interesting. Perhaps in some future piece of “Patchwork” he may be induced to favour us with a shred or two upon the subject, from his ample stores. We are happy to see that he has alluded to the scheme propounded by the Bishop of London for increasing the number of our colonial bishops, and especially for the appointment of one at Malta or Gibraltar. With reference to this matter, Captain Hall makes the following very just and pertinent observation:—

“It must be evident to all who have travelled on the continent, and observed the influence which the English exercise over the feelings of the people, that it is of the greatest consequence that those institutions should present a good specimen of the practical working of our ecclesiastical system. But as this, of course, must depend on the individual clergymen placed at the head of each, it has happened that, in several instances, the Anglo-Italian chapels have been unfortunate in this respect, and have exhibited to the enquiring natives either inefficiency, or, what is worse, strife and contention of parties. This arises, in a great measure, from the circumstance of those chapels being placed under no episcopal control.” (Vol. i., pp. 257, 258).

The whole subject of British continental chaplaincies is one which requires a great deal of looking into. The chapels in France are many of them in a most unsatisfactory condition, notwithstanding the respectable manner in which Bishop Luscombe, Mr. Lovett, M. Gourrier, and others who might be named, have

- maintained the dignity of divine worship in its metropolis. There may not be much room for complaint in the capital.

"But, were the task not invidious (as our author observes), instances might, perhaps, be adduced to show how essential it is to the welfare and character of our Church abroad, that its clergymen on the coasts of France should be placed under a bishop or suffragan of Jersey or Guernsey. That this would add greatly to their own respectability and happiness, and powers of being useful to their countrymen, I cannot doubt, any more than that it would contribute to give foreigners a far juster conception of what the Church of England really is, than they ever can have under the present working of the voluntary system in France. I am afraid even to allude to some scenes I have heard of the contests for a clergyman in different parts of that country.

"As things are at present arranged, I see no possible way of mending this matter—at least, in cases like the above, where the English are congregated in such great numbers as to form a considerable proportion of the whole society, and where, without their having the established usages of England to check extravagances, a sort of wealthy democracy has been got up, amenable neither to the habits of their own country, nor to those of their temporary adoption. In such places it is difficult to exaggerate the effect which springs from the absence of all wholesome control, in deteriorating the national character. On the other hand, it is incalculable what good might be done by the steady instrumentality of a well-regulated Church Establishment among them." (Vol. i., pp. 263, 264).

In many cases, as things at present stand, the impertinent assumption of private individuals is likely to form a serious bar to the personal comfort of chaplains, if not to prevent them from accepting the office at all, under the conditions imposed. Our author details an instance of the working of this lay interference. The instance itself is amusing enough; but that such things should be, is something far beyond a joke:—

"Not long ago an advertisement appeared in the papers for a chaplain, wanted at a certain small town. He was to be perfection in every point, and was to receive a salary of about 100*l.* a year. A clergyman duly qualified went over to France, on purpose to see if the situation was likely to suit him. When he arrived at the place he was received by two of her Majesty's subjects, who represented the small body of English residents on the spot.

"The clergyman, who possessed some fortune, was a gentleman by birth, as well as in manners and opinions, and the deputies did him the honour to point out the great advantages of being admitted to the dignity of their chaplain: but on coming to closer quarters, he found there were some strange conditions to be fulfilled.

"He was informed that in no case was he to baptize a child, or to bury a corpse, or to marry a couple, without first asking their permission! Neither was he to allow any brother clergyman to ascend his

pulpit, nor to enter his reading-desk, without the leave of the committee!!

"He listened to this new version of his clerical duties with undisturbed gravity, and then enquired what salary the chaplain might expect to receive from such a well-regulated institution? To which one of the authorities, not at all in jest, replied, 40*l.* per annum!

"It would seem as if these gentlemen had forgotten that we are not now living in the days of Goldsmith, when a man of education was held to be 'passing rich with forty pounds a year.' At all events, this proved rather too much for the risible faculties of the gentleman, who had gone so far in search of occupation in a position where he hoped his exertions might be useful. But the two lay deacons saw no joke in the matter, and became irate; upon which the clergyman took his leave, and said that, although it happened to be of no consequence to *him* to be put to the trouble and expense of a journey, it was scarcely fair to entice, by advertisement, other persons less able than himself to bear the burden of such a trip.

"Now, if this is to be taken as a specimen of the manner in which English chapels anywhere abroad may be conducted, it will show, I think, the great importance of placing, so far as may be possible, the nomination of chaplains in the hands of a highly educated authority, responsible to his order and to the country, for the due exercise of his episcopal functions.

"However the point of original nomination may be considered, there must, I should imagine, be but one opinion as to the great benefit which would spring from placing the chaplains, *after their appointment*, under the authority of a bishop of the Established Church, rather than exposing them to the control of ill-informed or ill-advised persons, who, although they would be the first to assail the power and authority of their bishops at home, would not hesitate, when abroad, to exercise ten times more power over the unprotected chaplains of their little expatriated congregations!" (Vol. i., pp. 264-267).

Well said, Captain Hall. But we must turn from this subject, important as it is, to present one or two more extracts, before winding up. The oft told tale of the ascent to Mount Vesuvius derives fresh interest at the hands of our author. The Captain, like other distinguished *litterati* before him, having arrived at the profound conclusion that people get on all the better by paying a due regard to the comforts of the inner man, thought it necessary, like an experienced campaigner as he is, to add a supply of fuel to his well-stocked commissariat:—

"When starting from Resina I suggested to Salvatore that we might as well carry some charcoal with us, to make a fire for boiling the water; and though he is the best bred person imaginable, from having kept company with the choicest spirits of Europe, he could not help smiling for a moment at my ignorance of volcanic habits.

"No! no! sir (cried he), there is no want of fire among those lava streams which have been running lately. We have only to look about

for a crevice in some of the eruptions of last week, and your kettle will be set a-boiling in a moment.'

"In effect I found that in the very lava current, the surface of which was so cool that we made it our breakfast table, without even our pat of butter being melted, we found not merely heat enough in a chink to boil water, but, by removing a loose stone or two, could gain a peep of the red-hot rock still glowing in the interior. Let people think of this, who, in consequence of the coolness of the exterior crust of the globe, distrust the assertions of the geologists about the probable existence of internal fires. It may also be useful to recollect that we can place our hand, without discomfort, on the outside of a burning fiery furnace of only a single brick in thickness. The actual presence of such facts on the great scale, on the summit of a volcano in eruption, immediately sets the mind thinking and speculating; whereas, when we meet with the same things in the ordinary kitchen-garden walk of life, they fail to make any profitable impression. This is fortunate enough; for if small matters were to be always making us reflect in the same way that great ones do, we should have no time left for anything but speculation!" (Vol. iii., pp. 90, 91).

The volcano was at the time in a state of eruption, and some of the jets of red-hot stones fell somewhat too near to be agreeable. The old guide meanwhile, by way, no doubt, of fortifying the nerves of his companions, entertained them with stories of accidents which had happened to persons who accompanied him on former occasions.

"A few years ago (commenced Salvatore, just after a pretty heavy shower of stones had fallen not very far within us, that is, between the cone and us), I came up the mountain with a party of gentlemen, one of whom insisted upon going not only round the cone, as we are now doing, but actually into the crater, although I told him that such an adventure was fraught with much more danger than the thing was worth.

"'Pooh! pooh! danger? (exclaimed this pig-headed gentleman), what care I for danger—am I not a soldier? Why, man, I have faced the foe before now! Lead the way, I'll follow!'

"I merely remarked (continued Salvatore, who is himself as brave as steel), that to face a human enemy and to face an active volcano, were two very different things.

"'Are you afraid to go?' (asked the gentleman). 'I don't much admire it (said I), but as I think I know how to evade the danger when it comes—having been at the work for nearly half a century—I'll go into the crater, if you are determined upon the adventure. Only I again warn you that there is great danger to an inexperienced stranger.'

"'Well! well! Come along,' cried the impatient soldier; and away we went—the young man flourishing his stick like a sword, while I, the old man, only shrugged my shoulders.

"'Now, sir, (said I to the gentleman) the only plan by which we

can hope to accomplish this expedition in safety is to be perfectly steady, and to stand as cool and collected as if nothing were happening, should a shower of stones come about our ears. I hope we may have none while we are in this awkward place ; but should we be so unfortunate, mind, your only chance is to stand fast and look upwards. It requires good nerves—so brace them sharp up.'

" ' Oh ! nerves ! is that all ? You shall see ! ' So away we went (said Salvatore), climbed the lip of the cup, descended the fearful abyss, and, though half choked with the fumes, saw all we wished to see, and were actually on our return, when the mountain roared like thunder, the ground shook, a furious eruption took place, and myriads of stones were shot a thousand feet into the air.

" ' Now, Signor mio (I called out), stand your ground, and make good use of those nerves you spoke of. Look up—be steady—and you may yet escape.'

" But the facer of mortal foes quailed before those of nature : he looked up as he was bid ; but when he beheld a cataract of fire falling on his head, the courage he had boasted of on the plain forsook him on the hill, and incontinently he fled. For my part (continued the energetic old man), I was too much afraid to fly. I never saw such a shower of stones, and only wonder how we were not both demolished. As it was, my companion had not run far before he was struck down by three stones, one of which broke his leg, the others stunned him, and I had enough to do to carry him on my shoulders out of the cone. Much work we had to get him to Naples, where the hotel keepers and the Italian doctors between them had the plucking of this precious pigeon for the next six months." (Vol. iii., pp. 95-97).

While this narrative was detailing, our travellers lost their way.

" This was a pleasant prospect truly, with a declining sun, and the mountain manifestly getting more and more angry every minute ! I never felt less in love with scientific research in my life, or more disposed to obey, with the utmost docility, the orders of any leader.

" ' I see a road (said the guide), but it is a dangerous one : for the rocks, as you may hear, are detaching themselves at every instant from the edges of the precipices.'

" As he spoke these words, a huge mass of ancient lava broke away from the cliff above us, and fell thundering into the midst of the party. Salvatore, who was before me, leaped forward, and I, following instinctively, sprung hap-hazard among the rugged strata, to avoid the fate which would have attended a moment's delay. The lad who was behind us, whose terror I dare say was not greater than ours, but whose presence of mind was less, cast from him my camera lucida and a little basket he was carrying on his head, and leaped right downwards into a crevice in the rock, and thus escaped, as by a miracle, being crushed like an egg-shell. We thought he was gone ; and, indeed, had he performed the same feat a very little further on, he might have escaped the falling rock, from its being larger than the crack was wide, but he must have been roasted alive by the red-hot

pit! As it was, we had enough to do to extricate him from his prison; and having packed up the basket and the instrument, made the best of our way out of such a perilous neighbourhood." (Vol. iii., pp. 98, 99).

At Lucca, Captain Hall fell in with some very interesting memorials of the illustrious Tasso. An Italian gentleman, of the name of Foppa, had taken, it appears, an extraordinary passion for collecting everything belonging to the mighty master, especially his manuscript writings, those of his oppressor, Alfonso, Duke of Ferrara, and of his faithful mistress, Leonora, the Duke's sister. M. Foppa left these documents to the Falconieri family, who, in their turn, disposed of them to Count Alberti, the gentleman who favoured Captain Hall with a sight of them. It was the wish of their proprietor to publish them in London and Paris simultaneously, but he has not yet been able to agree with any house about the terms of publication. There occur in this collection numerous traits of all the parties concerned, some of them trivial in themselves, but invested by the renown of the poet with a high degree of importance:—

"One day, Tasso having, it would seem, been struck with some piece of embroidery done by Leonora's sister, she made him a present of it; and he, as in poetical duty bound, wrote her a copy of verses on the occasion, the original of which, in his handwriting, forms one of Count Alberti's papers. Leonora, on reading them, felt, or affected to feel, a little jealous of this transaction, and playfully scolded the poet for his defective allegiance. Upon this he indites a sonnet, beseeching her to embroider for him the cover of a book which she was then reading. She of course complies, and we saw the letter accompanying the gift, as well as the gift itself, which bears on one of its blank pages an inscription in Tasso's own handwriting, declaring that he would never part with it till his latest breath. The book is Boccaccio's *Essay or Treatise on Woman*, which I am told (for I never saw it except on this occasion) is a sharp satire on the sex. In Leonora's note accompanying the present, she alludes to the subject of the book in very lively terms, calling her own conduct truly evangelical, inasmuch as, by treating him in this way, she obeys the Gospel precept of returning good for evil. The book is a pocket volume, very neatly embroidered on the outside. Within, on the first blank page, there is a sonnet, in Tasso's writing, in praise of the lady and her workmanship, which, he declares, far beats that of the spider, which, seeing it, is struck dumb. Nevertheless (he goes on to say), the web of love, which is thrown over his heart, though still finer than either, is quite strong enough to bind him for ever."

"Count Alberti showed us Tasso's copy of Virgil, of which the margins are filled with annotations in his handwriting. One passage was pointed out in which Virgil indulges in some reflections upon courts and courtiers. This has given occasion to Tasso to add a note

of great asperity against princes. There is also a well-thumbed and scribbled-over copy of Polybius, and another of Livy on some military matters, which it is probable Tasso had studied closely, that he might acquire a knowledge of battles and sieges while composing his 'Jerusalem Delivered.' " (Vol. iii., pp. 199-201).

Some weeks after, our travellers visited the place of Tasso's confinement—the very hospital of Santa Anna, at Ferrara, where he had been locked up by Alfonso, for aspiring to the affections of his sister; the tyrant sneeringly remarking, that "as Torquato seemed to be mad, it was fit that he should be sent to a hospital to be duly purified."

"On one of the walls, just outside the door, we read the name of 'BYRON,' cut deeply into the stone; and the *custode* informed us that he saw the bard carve the letters himself.

"He added that the noble poet had remained an hour and a half alone in the cell; and it is not unlikely that he then conceived the beautiful 'Lament of Tasso'—or more probably he may have framed those still more beautiful and indignant stanzas in *Childe Harold*, where he gibbets the memory of the tyrannical duke." (Vol. iii., p. 203).

We had marked several other passages for quotation, but to insert them would carry us far beyond the limits of a reasonable article. We cannot, however, take leave of these delightful volumes without noticing the chapter on Etiquette as one of the wittiest, and the description of the Tide Harbour as one of the most beautifully graphic, pieces of composition which we have met with for a long time.

ART. III.—*A Letter respectfully addressed to the Rev. J. H. Newman, upon some Passages in his Letter to the Rev. Dr. Jelf.* By N. WISEMAN, D.D., Bishop of Melipotamus. London, 1841. 8vo.

2. *A Letter to N. Wiseman, D.D. (calling himself Bishop of Melipotamus), containing Remarks on his Letter to Mr. Newman.* By the Rev. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A. London, 1841. 8vo.

3. *A Second Letter to N. Wiseman, D.D., on the Foundation of the Romish Doctrines of Satisfaction, Indulgences, Purgatory, and Suffrages for the Dead.* By the Rev. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A. London, 1841. 8vo.

4, 5. *Third and Fourth Letters to N. Wiseman, D.D., on the Romish Doctrine of Satisfaction.* By the Rev. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A. London, 1841. 8vo.

6. *Remarks on a Letter from the Rev. William Palmer, M.A.* By N. WISEMAN, D.D., Bishop of Melipotamus. London, 1841. 8vo.
7. *A Fifth Letter to N. Wiseman, D.D., containing a Reply to his Remarks on Letter I., with additional Proofs of the Idolatry and Superstition of Romanism.* By the Rev. W. PALMER, M.A. London, 1841. 8vo.
8. *Le V\'eritable Tr\'esor Cach\'e, ou Definition des Indulgences, suivies d'un R\'ecueil de Bulles des Souveraines Pontifes, avec quelques pratiques de pi\'et\'e extraits de meilleurs ma\'itres de la vie spirituelle.* Turin, 1826. 18mo.
9. *Il Tesoro di Grazia, ossia Raccolta d' Indulgenze concedute in perpetuo dai Sommi Pontefici a tutti i fedeli de l' uno e dell' altro sesso.* Roma, con permesso de Superiori, 1838. 16mo.
10. *Indulgences granted by Sovereign Pontiffs to the Faithful, who perform the Devotions and Pious Works prescribed; collected by a Member of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgence in Rome, and translated into English, with permission of Superiors; to which are added the Prayers at Mass.* Second Edition, Improved. Dublin: Printed by and for the Catholic Book Society, 1839. 18mo.

“When Greek meets Greek, then comes the tug of war.”

OF the various champions of Romanism, or the doctrinal system taught and maintained by the modern Church of Rome, Dr. Wiseman is, confessedly, one of the most accomplished. In Mr. Palmer, however, he has encountered an antagonist of no contemptible learning and research. We propose to offer to our readers an outline of their discussions; and shall only premise that Mr. Palmer has entered the lists with the titular “Bishop of Melipotamus,” in consequence of his having ascertained that Mr. Newman did not intend to make any reply to the Letter which Dr. Wiseman had addressed to him.

“It is a serious thing (says Dr. Wiseman, in his Letter to Mr. Newman) to charge us with setting up the blessed Virgin in place of the Holy Trinity, and purgatory instead of heaven and hell. We naturally ask, what shall be considered sufficient *evidence* of there being an *authoritative teaching*, that supersedes the solemn and synodal decrees of our Church, and makes us *responsible, in solidum*, for its lessons?” (p. 6.)

To this charge Mr. Palmer replies in the following terms:—

“Without doubt, ‘it is a serious thing’ to make this charge, and ‘it is a serious thing’ for you to hear it made. You do not relish such plain speaking. I must, however, entreat you to bear with me,

while I proceed to establish its substantial accuracy—while I demonstrate that the blessed Virgin, the saints, indulgences, or purgatory, are commonly and authoritatively set before the souls of your people, instead of the Trinity, heaven, and hell; and viewed as prominent objects of regard, dispensers of mercy, or means of obtaining it. After this I shall proceed to consider the remainder of your Letter.” (*Palmer, Letter I., to N. Wiseman, D.D., p. 13.*)

I. The first point noticed by Mr. Palmer is the worship of the blessed Virgin Mary by the Church of Rome. “*The blessed Virgin* (he says) *is authoritatively set before your souls instead of the Trinity.*” On this assertion he remarks: “It is not meant that the Roman Church disbelieves the Trinity, but that the Virgin receive honours which are due only to the Trinity—honours which interfere with the sole prerogative of the Deity.” (*Ibid.*) In proof of this statement, he adduces various testimonies from popes and doctors of that Church, and from offices of devotion in use among her members.

1. His first proof is the memorable passage from the present pontiff, Gregory XVI.’s encyclical letter to the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops of that Church, which we cited for the same purpose in our number for January, 1841, page 178, to which we respectfully refer our readers. In that passage the blessed Virgin is expressly termed “our patroness and deliverer” (or “protectress”), and divine inspiration is ascribed to her; notwithstanding, these attributes are, in the Holy Scriptures, directly given to Almighty God and to the Holy Spirit.

“And now, Sir, (says Mr. Palmer) perilous and idolatrous as such sentiments are, have they ever once been publicly objected to by a single member of your communion? Has any one of you ever *dared* to protest against this ascription of the attributes of Deity to a creature? Will you yourself venture to utter a word in opposition to it? I am afraid this would be rather too much to expect from any ‘vicar apostolic.’ And why is it that the whole body of your communion have remained silent, and refrained from uttering a word in censure of language so plainly savouring of heresy and idolatry? Why is it, that even those amongst you who may disapprove of such statements have remained mute and confounded? Because they emanate from *authority*—an authority to which you are obliged to submit. You have asked for some proof that the Virgin Mary is *authoritatively* put forward in your Church instead of the Trinity; and I believe you have received a sufficient answer.” (*Palmer, Letter I., pp. 15, 16.*)

Dr. Wiseman, however, does not coincide with Mr. Palmer’s “belief,” but adduces, in his “*Remarks*” on Mr. Palmer’s Letter, various passages from the under-mentioned ecclesiastical writers, which he considers as supporting his view of the subject,

viz., Ephrem Syrus, who wrote about the middle of the fourth century; John Damascenus, whose “Exposition of the Orthodox Faith,” a compound of Aristotelian philosophy and patristic doctrine, was written about the year 750; the Acts of St. Mary of Egypt, which were written early in the sixth century; Gregory, Bishop of Nazianzum, who wrote principally between the years 362 and 389; Methodius, Bishop of Patara; Amphilochius, who flourished towards the close of the fourth century; and Ildephonsus, Bishop of Toledo, in the middle of the seventh century. The whole of this imposing array of patristical authorities Mr. Palmer shows to be utterly worthless, as they are either *spurious* or *apocryphal*, or are *not applicable*, as in the passages cited from Amphilochius and Ildephonsus. The conclusion of this part of Mr. Palmer’s argument is irresistible. Dr. Wiseman has not been able to produce any justification of the declarations and prayers addressed to the blessed Virgin by Romanists. On the contrary, Mr. Palmer’s “conclusion remains untouched, and even strengthened—that the Virgin Mary receives amongst them honours which are only due to God.” (*Letter V.*, p. 32.)

2. From Cardinal Bona, Mr. Palmer adduces the following prayer, in proof that “the Virgin Mary is presented instead of the Trinity, and that she is regarded as the dispenser of mercy.”

“Oh most sweet Virgin Mary, Mother of God and our Lord Jesus Christ, *refuge of sinners*, and *mother of mercy*, I commit myself this day and evermore to thy peculiar *protection*, with most humble devotion. Place me near unto thee, and *protect me from all my enemies, visible and invisible*; say unto my soul, I AM THY SALVATION; direct me, thy servant, in all my ways and actions; console me in all my grief and afflictions; defend and preserve me from all evils and dangers; turn thy face unto me when the end of my life shall come; and may thy consolation, in that tremendous hour, rejoice my spirit. *Thou canst do all that thou wilt in heaven and earth, nor can any resist thy will*, for thou obtainest from the Almighty whatever thou sekest. Hear, therefore, and *receive my prayers*, and despise me not when I confide in thy mercy. Behold, *I fall down before thee*, most gracious Virgin—I *fall down and worship* IN THEE thy Son; and I implore thy suffrages to obtain that my sins may be blotted out, to reconcile the heart of thy Son to my heart, that He may possess me, and make me a man according unto his heart.”* (*Letter I.*, pp. 17, 18.)

* “In hora illa tremenda consolatio tua lætificet spiritum meum. Omnia potes quæcumque vis in cælo et in terra, nec est qui possit resistere voluntati tuæ. . . . Ecce procido cōram te, benignissima Virgo, procido et adoro in te Filium tuum,” &c. (*Jo. Bonæ Presbyt. Cardinalis, Horologium Asceticum, § 2. Opuscula Spirituality, t. i., p. 13.*)

On this prayer Mr. Palmer offers the following just, but severe remarks to Dr. Wiseman :—

“ If (says Mr. Palmer) this prayer does not ascribe to the blessed Virgin the divine attribute of ‘dispensing mercy,’ I know not what words can do so. She is addressed exactly in the terms which we should use in praying to the second or third Persons of the Holy Trinity. We see in it the same feeling of confidence in the protection of the Being addressed—the same degree of worship which is offered to Jesus Christ. ‘I fall down and worship ~~IN THEE~~ thy Son.’ *The Virgin Mary is worshipped with the honour due to God!* You will not, I venture to say, express any disapprobation of this prayer, any more than of the sentiments of Gregory XVI., or of the authorized and indulgenced prayers which I have cited above. You will be satisfied to say, that such things are not enforced upon your consciences by the decrees of the Council of Trent. Then, if they are not, your guilt is so much the greater in practising them. By your own confession, such idolatrous invocations are not compulsory on you. They are therefore *voluntary*; and you are wholly without excuse or justification. It is in vain to allege that they are not universally approved or received. What *proofs* can you afford of this assertion? When have you yourself protested against them? Who amongst you lifts up his voice against them? You content yourselves with *general disclaimers* of superstition and idolatry, but you will never venture to lay your finger on any specific case amongst the thousands which are authorized amongst you.” (*Ibid.* pp. 18, 19.)

Nothing daunted at this reproof, the titular Bishop of Melipotamus boldly denies that the sentences—“Behold, I fall down before thee, most gracious Virgin; I fall down and worship ~~IN THEE~~ thy Son”—are idolatrous; and, in proof of his denial, he affirms that “the blessed Virgin is constantly called by the fathers the *temple* of God, consequently the place in which he is to be worshipped.” (*Remarks*, p. 33.) In pp. 33–36, he supports his assertions by quotations from Peter Chrysologus, Ephrem Syrus, Cyril of Alexandria, John Damascenus, the poet Sedulius, Maximus Taurinensis, and a *spurious* passage from Methodius. On these various quotations Mr. Palmer remarks :—

“ We fully allow the doctrine taught by all these fathers. The blessed Virgin did most undoubtedly become the temple of the Godhead, by conceiving our Lord Jesus Christ: but, Sir, do you mean to say, that *she is still the temple of the Godhead in this sense?* No: she ceased to be so when our Saviour was born. I can produce higher authorities than you have cited, to prove that *every believer* is a temple of God. St. Paul says, ‘Know ye not that ye are the *temple* of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?’ (1 Cor. iii. 16.) ‘Know ye not that your body is the *temple* of the Holy Ghost, which is in you?’ (1 Cor. vi. 19.) And yet, what would you think of saying to any

Joseph and his worshippers ; and, in fine, the service of Christians is supposed to be divided between Jesus and Mary ! And yet this is a prayer sanctioned by the highest authority in your Church, and unscrupulously published in your most approved practical treatises on indulgences." (*Letter I.*, pp. 27, 28.)

The first and last of these prayers Dr. Wiseman undertakes to defend, by adducing two passages from two *heathen* poets, Terence and Horace, and from 1 Paralip. (*i.e.*, 1 Chron.) xxix. 21., Luke ii. 52, xv. 21, (*Remarks*, p. 37), and four inscriptions in illustration of what he calls "the practice of the ancient Church." (pp. 38, 39.) These inscriptions, however, are *not* of early date. On the *first* of them Dr. Wiseman says, that "Muratori considers this inscription of the fifth or [early part of the] sixth century." (p. 38.) But, unfortunately for him, Mr. Palmer has not taken his assertion upon trust, but has followed up his authority. And what is the result ? "Three most eminent critics, including Fontanini, Archbishop of Ancyra, attribute the inscription to the ninth century ; a fourth (Scalabrinius) thinks it ought to be referred to the fifth or sixth century ; and Muratori himself gives *no* opinion as to its date." (*Letter V.*, p. 37.) The *second* inscription appears, from Muratori, to be of the *ninth* century ; the third cannot be earlier than the *seventh* century, but *may* have been of *much later* date ; and in the *fourth* Mr. Palmer has detected a sad flaw in Dr. Wiseman's chronology : besides which, this inscription can have no weight in a matter of controversy, not only because it proceeded from the pen of a layman of no authority, but also because we do not know *when* it was placed, or with what object. (*Ibid.* pp. 37-39.) Moreover, these four inscriptions are utterly worthless for the purpose for which Dr. Wiseman has cited them, because "they contain no 'acts of homage,' no 'addresses' to God and the saints in common, and therefore they cannot justify his prayers." (*Ibid.* p. 39.) And thus, says Mr. Palmer, addressing the Doctor—

"It appears that you have been unable to produce, either from Scripture or antiquity, any language which can justify Romanists in addressing, at the same moment, the same homage and prayers to created beings and to God." (p. 40.).....Such, then, is the result of your defence of the prayers and homage offered to the blessed Virgin by the most eminent authorities in the Roman communion. You have not attempted to deny that they attribute divine powers to creatures ; that they solicit from them favours which God alone can bestow ; that they place created beings on a level with their Creator. You have entirely failed to bring from Scripture or Tradition any instances of similar forms. I have a right, therefore, to re-assert that they are idolatrous ; that your communion is deeply tinged with idolatrous practices ; and that those idolatries are openly defended and justified by the very persons, whose office (if it was legitimately acquired) would compel them,

under pain of damnation, to oppose everything that is connected with idolatry." (*Ibid.* p. 42.)

Dr. Wiseman next proceeds to a defence of prayers to saints. (*Remarks*, pp. 53-66.) Here again Mr. Palmer follows him step by step, and examines the quotations which he adduces from the fathers, in not one of which (he shows) "there are any direct prayers to saints for favours which God only can bestow; nor are the saints addressed at the same time and in the same manner as God." Consequently the objections which he has offered to the prayers and language of the Romish Church remain unanswered. (*Letter V.*, pp. 45-51.) Mr. Palmer then proceeds to evince, by numerous direct and explicit quotations from the fathers, and other ecclesiastical writers, that Romanism is utterly condemned by catholic antiquity; and satisfactorily vindicates the early fathers from the imputations of idolatry and superstition, which Dr. Wiseman's "*Remarks*" tend to fix upon them. "Their doctrines (Mr. Palmer truly observes) stand out in bold relief against the heathenish corruptions which Romanism sanctions and defends." (*Ibid.* p. 80.)

Mr. Palmer concludes his reply to Dr. Wiseman's strictures with ten pages of "additional proofs of Romish idolatry and superstition." We have room only for one example, extracted from the "*Moral Theology*" of St. Alphonsus Liguori; whose biographer informs us that the cardinal reporter of the congregation of rites, in May, 1802, declared that "the theologians who had examined his manuscript and printed works could find nothing censurable in them." * Consequently the passage we are about to quote exhibits the actual sentiments of modern Rome, while it describes the mode in which those who are in their last agony are to be aided by the priest:—

"When the sick man comes to his agony, let the priest employ the usual arms of the Church in his assistance. 1. Let him often *sprinkle him with blessed water*, especially if he is troubled by diabolical temptations..... 2. Let him fortify him *with the sign of the cross*, and bless him, saying, 'God the Father, who created thee, bless thee,' &c..... 3. Let him frequently give him *the image of our Saviour and of Mary to kiss*. 4. Let him take care that the sick person gains *all the indulgences that he can*, and especially receives benediction in the article of death, with plenary indulgence granted by Benedict XIV..... 5. Let him suggest some sentiment of grief, conformity, hope in the passion of God *and the intercession of St. Mary*..... 6. Let him endeavour that the names of Jesus *and Mary* be very frequently invoked, at least mentally, and the prayer, '*Mary, mother of grace*,' be said. 7. In the last agony, let him cause the bystanders to say *many litanies of*

* "*Lives of St. Alphonsus Liguori*," &c., p. 55.

the Virgin Mary for the sick man. It is desirable to procure the bell of the agony to be rung.....8. As the time of expiring draws near, let the priest, with a mournful voice and bended knees, recite the accustomed prayers of the Church, 'Go forth,' &c.....9. (Directions as to handling the sick person). 10. When he is near death, let him give him a *blessed candle*, and thus profess that he dies in the faith. 11. While he is yet sensible, it will be advisable to give him absolution *frequently*, after a short reconciliation..... Let him admonish him *often to call on the names of Jesus and Mary*.*

"When the sick man is near expiring, the [following] acts should be recited, *without pausing, and in a loud voice* [by the priest.]

"Lord Jesu, receive my spirit. My God, help me; permit me to come and love thee for ever. My Jesus, my Love, I love thee. I repent. I wish that I had never offended thee! *O Mary, my hope*, help me, pray for me to Jesus. My Jesus, for thy passion, save me. I love thee! *Mary, my mother*, in this hour help me. *St. Joseph*, help me. *Archangel Michael*, defend me. *Guardian Angel*, guard me. *Saint N.* (here let the principal protector of the sick man be named), commend me to Jesus Christ. *Saints of God*, intercede for me. Jesus, Jesus, Jesus. *Jesus and Mary*, I give my heart and my soul to you!"† (*Letter F.*, pp. 88, 89.)

We should only injure the effect of this most awful scene by offering any comments of our own upon it. With Mr. Palmer, we "leave it to the reflections of the reader. May the last hours of those he loves have other consolations—and peace!"

III. The third point, which Mr. Palmer undertook to show in his first Letter to Dr. Wiseman, 'regards purgatory, or indulgences, as "means of obtaining mercy," and that they are preached "instead of heaven and hell."' That is, as Mr. Palmer subsequently explains himself, that—

"Indulgences (which are connected with purgatory) are made *to take the place* which Scripture and Catholic tradition assign only to considerations connected with the eternal state; that they are presented to the consciences and the hopes of your people, to influence them to the performance of duties which ought only to be urged on the motives of the love and fear of God. This is what we complain of. We see good works urged amongst you on motives which obscure and interfere with the grand and simple motives which revelation places before us. When we would excite our brethren to the performance of good works, we can but say to them, 'Yield yourselves unto God, *as those that are alive from the dead*, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God.' (Rom. vi. 13.) We can but quote to them our Saviour's words, 'If ye love me, keep my commandments..... He that bath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and

* Ligorio, *Theologia Moralis*, t. ix., p. 175 (*Praxis Confessarii*, n. 276.)

† *Ibid.*, pp. 178, 179.

will manifest myself unto him.' (John xiv. 15-21.) And again : ' Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal. For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.' (Matt. vi. 20, 21.) These are the only motives which Scripture and Tradition place before us. Our works are to be done simply in reliance on God's assistance, and with a view to show forth our love and obedience to him, without which we should forfeit eternal life. Not so with you. Every good work has in your eyes a very different sort of value. It is a satisfaction for sins ; it is a means of obtaining so many days or years of indulgence from the tortures of purgatory." (*Letter I.*, pp. 29, 30.)

In corroboration of these statements, Mr. Palmer adduces several passages from the " *Traité des Indulgences* " of J. Bouvier, Bishop of Mans, which may be considered not only as an exhibition of the Romish doctrine concerning indulgences generally, but as a statement of what is specially taught in FRANCE on this subject:—

" Are your people to be excited to visit the sick, to give alms to the poor, to hear mass, to repent of their sins and confess to a priest, to receive the holy eucharist, to pray for the extirpation of heresies, the propagation of the Catholic faith, and for the Church generally? You promise them a *plenary indulgence* on certain feast-days in the year.* Do you wish to excite the people to repeat devotional offices during their life, and to recommend their souls to God at the hour of death? You promise them indulgences. (*Ibid.* p. 185.) Is it your desire that they should instruct their children, relations, or servants, in the Christian doctrine? You offer them two hundred days of indulgence for doing so. (p. 185.) They meditate on our Saviour's passion to gain one hundred days of indulgence. (p. 186.) They examine their consciences and repent of their sins, resolve to amend them) and recite the Lord's Prayer, to gain the same amount of indulgence. (p. 186.) They accompany the holy sacrament when it is brought to the sick ; endeavour to bring back into the right way those who have wandered from it ; and practise other good works in honour of our Lord. And for what reason? To gain an indulgence of one hundred days in purgatory. (p. 191.) Is it considered desirable to promote the spirit of prayer? One indulgence is promised to all those who instruct the people to meditate or to offer prayer, and another to all who offer prayer every day for half or a quarter of an hour. (p. 213.) In short, there is not a good work or a devotional practice amongst you, which is not presented as a means of obtaining *indulgences*. Your whole system depends on the popular belief in indulgences, and the popular wish to obtain them. Your confraternities, your charitable and religious works of all kinds, are vitally dependent on them. The promise of future glory, the desire to show love and gratitude to Him who redeemed us with His own blood, are insufficient to excite your people

* Bouvier, " *Traité des Indulgences*," pp. 183, 184.

to the discharge of Christian duties. They require the stimulant of *indulgences* to rouse them into activity. And what *are* those indulgences? Which of the fathers ever wrote a treatise on indulgences, or even mentioned them? Were they known to Augustine, to Chrysostom, to Gregory, or to any of the fathers for a thousand years after Christ? You are well aware that there is a profound silence in Christian antiquity on this subject—that the only indulgences known for a thousand years were *remission of canonical punishments imposed in this life*. And this *novelty* it is which now constitutes the moving power of your religion, and which usurps amongst your people that influence which revelation assigns to heaven and hell—to the love and the fear of God.” (*Letter I.*, pp. 31, 32.)

On the subject of the fire of purgatory, Dr. Wiseman (*Remarks*, pp. 79, 80) adduces three passages, from Augustine, Isidore, and Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa: these, Mr. Palmer affirms, do not relate to that doctrine; and, as he promises to examine them in a future Letter, together with Dr. Wiseman’s remarks on the preceding quotation relating to indulgences, we shall probably recur to this topic on some future occasion. In the mean time, we think we shall render a service to our readers (we can scarcely hope to contribute much additional information to so well furnished a champion of our Church as Mr. Palmer has proved himself to be) by exhibiting the popular doctrine of the Romish Church, as it is actually taught in accredited treatises printed at Rome, at Turin, and at Dublin.

“The word indulgence comes from the Latin word *indulgere*, to remit to, or to pardon, a person whatever faults he has committed. What is now called an indulgence was formerly termed remission.*

“The punishment which is due to sin is of two kinds—the one eternal, the other temporal. The guilt of sin, and the eternal punishment due to mortal sin, are remitted through the infinite merits of Jesus Christ, in the holy sacrament of penance, provided we approach it with proper dispositions, or by perfect contrition, which should include a desire of confession; but all the temporal punishment is not generally forgiven in this sacrament. A portion of this punishment commonly remains to be atoned for, in this life, by good works, by penitential practices, and by indulgences: otherwise we shall suffer in the fire of purgatory, according to the satisfaction required by God’s infinite justice.

“An indulgence is, therefore, the remission of the temporal punishment which generally remains due to sins already forgiven in the sacrament of penance, as to the guilt and eternal punishment. This remission is made by the application of the merits and satisfactions

* “Le mot indulgence vient du Latin *indulgere*, remettre ou pardonner au quelqu’un les fautes qu’il a faites. Autrefois on appelait rémission ce qu’on nomme aujourd’hui indulgence.” (*Le Véritable Trésor Cache*, p. 7. Turin, 1826.)

which are contained in the treasures of the Church. These treasures are the accumulation of the spiritual goods arising from the infinite merits and satisfactions of Jesus Christ, with the superabundant merits and satisfactions of the blessed Virgin Mary, of the holy martyrs, and of the other saints, which ultimately derive their efficacy from the merits and satisfactions of Christ, who is the only Mediator of redemption. These celestial treasures, as they are called by the Council of Trent, are committed by the divine bounty to the dispensation of the Church, the sacred spouse of Jesus Christ, and are the ground and matter of indulgences. They are infinite in regard to the merits of Christ, and cannot, therefore, be ever exhausted." (!!!)*

Our readers, however, must not suppose that any one may gain indulgences in any way or at any time which he may choose. They can only be acquired at such times, and in such places, manner, and quantity, as the "Sovereign Pontiffs" may determine: hence we read of *partial*, *plenary*, and *most plenary* indulgences.

1. In reply to the question, *what is meant by a PARTIAL indulgence?* the credulous Papist at Rome is taught that—

"It means that indulgence of days, years, quarantines, and the like, which does not remit the entire punishment, but only that part of it which corresponds to the penance anciently enjoined by the sacred canons. And when it is said, in a bull, that whosoever shall visit a particular church, or repeat a particular prayer, shall gain one year's indulgence, it means that the whole of that punishment shall be remitted, which would have been remitted if the party had performed one year's penance, agreeably to ancient custom; which may be much more than liberating him from purgatory for one year, because to one year's penance perhaps corresponds the remission of many years from purgatory—which event cannot be known by us, but only by God."†

In reply to the question, *what is meant by a PLENARY indulgence?* the answer is—

"It means that indulgence which remits the entire punishment; so that, if a great sinner, after having confessed all his sins and received absolution, were to acquire a single plenary indulgence, and to die im-

* Indulgences granted by the Sovereign Pontiffs to the Faithful. (pp. v., vi.)

† "*Che cosa s'intende per indulgenza parziale?* — S'intende quella indulgenza di giorni, anni, quarantene, e simili, la quale non rimette tutta la pena, ma quella parte solamente, che corrisponde alla penitenza, che anticamente era ingiunta da' sacri canoni: e quando nella bolla si dice, che chi visiterà la tal chiesa, o reciterà la tale orazione guadagnerà un anno d' indulgenza, vuol dire che gli si rimetterà tutta quella pena, che gli sarebbe stata rimessa, se avesse fatto un anno di penitenza conforme all' uso antico, che puo essere assai piu che liberarlo per un anno dal purgatorio, atteso che ad un anno di penitenza corrisponderà forse la remissione di molti anni di purgatorio: cosa la quale non può sapersi da noi, ma solamente da Dio." (*Il Tesoro di Grazia*, pp. 3, 4.)

mediately afterwards, he would go directly to heaven, without passing through purgatory." *

Such is the doctrine of partial and plenary indulgences, which is taught at ROME, "with the permission of the superiors." With it coincides the following account, printed at TURIN :—

"A plenary or total indulgence, according to Thomas Aquinas, is that which entirely and generally satisfies God for all the punishments due to sins both in this world and the next, *and which places the sinner again in that state of grace in which his soul was after it had been washed in the water of baptism: whence it follows, that, if a person dies in that state, his soul will pass out of time to a blessed eternity, without experiencing the flames of purgatory, in order that it may be purified.*" †

The DUBLIN "Manual of Indulgences," "translated into English with the permission of superiors," does not speak out quite so plainly as the Romish doctors on the other side of the Alps. It says that—

"By a plenary indulgence we gain the remission of all the temporal punishment which remains due to sins forgiven, provided we have the proper dispositions, and comply with the conditions required." (p. vii.)

3. The indulgences granted during the jubilee are *most plenary*. This appears from the expressions used in the Papal bulls announcing them. The first bull for a jubilee was issued in the year 1299, by Boniface VIII., a man of intolerable pride and ambition, of whom it was commonly said, that he entered into the pontificate like a fox, continued in it like a lion, and died like a dog. In that bull he granted "*not only a plenary and larger, but a MOST PLENARY REMISSION OF ALL THEIR SINS,*" to those who should reverently visit the churches of the apostles, provided they were truly penitent, and had confessed, or who should repent and confess, every following hundredth year. ‡ As this jubilee was very profitable to the Romans, from the vast number of persons (it is said upwards of two millions)

* "*Che cosa s'intende per indulgenza plenaria?—S'intende quella indulgenza, la quale rimette tutta la pena in maniera, che se un gran peccatore, dopo confessati tutti i suoi peccati, e ricevuta assoluzione, acquistasse una sola indulgenza plenaria, ed immediatamente se ne morisse, anderebbe a dirittura al paradiso senza toccar purgatorio.*" (*Ibid.* p. 3.)

† "L'indulgence plénière ou total, dit St. Thomas, est celle, qui satisfait entièrement et généralement à Dieu pour toutes les peines dûes aux péchés tant en ce monde que dans l'autre; et remet le pécheur dans cet état de grace, où était son âme après avoir été lavée dans les eaux du baptême: d'où il s'en suit, que mourant dans cet état, l'âme passerait du tems à l'éternité bien-heureuse, sans l'éprouver les flammes du purgatoire, pour être purifiée." (*Le Véritable Trésor Caché*, p. 17.)

‡ "Omnibus.....ad basilicas ipsas accedentibus reverenter, vere pœnitentibus et confessis. vel qui vere pœnitebunt et confitebuntur. *non solum plenam et longiorem, IMO PLENISSIMAM OMNIUM SUORUM CONCEDIMUS, ET CONCEDEMUS OMNIUM VENIAM PECCATORUM.*" (*Coquelines, Bullarum Romanorum Pontificum Amplissima Collectio*, tom. iii., p. 94, col. 2).

who resorted to Rome, Clement VI., who was residing at Avignon, found it convenient, in 1350, to reduce the centenary jubilee of his predecessor to fifty years; Urban VI. further reduced it to thirty-three years, and Paul II. to twenty-five years. Clement VI., in his bull for this purpose, granted not only a plenary indulgence to those who should visit the churches, but to such as might die on their way to Rome he audaciously and peremptorily *commanded the angels of paradise to introduce the soul, being altogether freed from purgatory, into the glory of paradise, or heaven.** We might adduce similar passages from subsequent bulls for Papal jubilees; but we will confine ourselves to that issued by Pope Leo XII., May 18th, 1824, for the jubilee of 1825, in which he also usurped the prerogative of Almighty God, in granting a plenary remission of sins. “During this year of jubilee *WE mercifully, in the Lord, grant and impart the MOST PLENARY INDULGENCE, REMISSION, AND PARDON OF ALL THEIR SINS, to all the faithful in Christ, of both sexes, who are truly penitent, and have confessed, and who have likewise refreshed themselves with the holy communion;* provided, if Romans or inhabitants of the city, they shall have devoutly visited the churches of the city, of the blessed Peter and Paul, of St. John Lateran, and of St. Mary Maggiore, at least once a day for thirty days, whether successive or interrupted, natural or even ecclesiastical, to be computed from the first vespers of one day to the entire [or complete] evening twilight of the succeeding day; but, if they be foreigners, or in any respect strangers, provided they shall have devoutly visited [these churches] at least fifteen days; and shall have poured forth pious prayers to God for the exaltation of the holy Church, the **EXTIRPATION OF HERESIES,**† the concord of Catholic princes, and the salvation and tranquillity of Christendom.”‡

* “*Prorsus mandamus angelos paradisi quantum animam illius a purgatorio penitus absolutam in paradisi gloriam introducant.*” (*Bulla. Clem. VI. Ultrajecti*, A. D. 1653. Cited in Stillingfleet’s “*Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly represented,*” § viii.)

† Prayers for the *extirpation of heresies*, and for the **EXALTATION** of the Catholic [that is, the ROMISH] Church, are among the conditions of the plenary indulgence recently granted by the present Pope, Gregory XVI., to the Bishop of Saint Flour, in France, for all the faithful who shall, on the octave of that saint, visit the Cathedral of St. Flour. (*Archives du Christianisme*, Nov. 13, 1841, p. 168.)

‡ “*Quo quidem jubilæi anno durante omnibus utriusque sexûs Christi fidelibus verè pœnitentibus et confessis, sacraque communione refertis, qui beatorum Petri et Pauli, nec non sancti Joannis Lateranensis, et sanctæ Mariæ Majoris de urbe basilicas, semel saltem in die, per triginta continuos, aut interpolatos, dies sive naturales, sive etiam ecclesiasticos, nimirum a primis vesperebus unius diei usque ad integrum ipsius subsequentis diei crepusculum computandos, si Romani vel incolæ urbis, si verò peregrini aut aliâs externi fuerint, per quindecim saltem hujusmodi dies devote visitaverint, et pro sanctæ*

What an awful compound of error and of blasphemy do the foregoing extracts present ! What, but utter ignorance of the word of God, could have invented the term *indulgence* !—and towards what ? Towards *sin*, which is *the transgression of the holy law* of God—towards that which brought the Lord of life and glory from the habitation of holiness down to earth, to be “the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world,” (1 John ii. 2) ;—indulgence towards that which crucified the Son of God, for it was *our* sins which he bare in his own body on the tree. (1 Pet. ii. 24.)

Our readers scarcely need to be reminded, that the profligate sale of indulgences was one of the principal causes of the Reformation. Tax-tables were prepared and printed by authority, stating the different sums at which absolution might be purchased for all actual or imaginable crimes. An authentic edition of one of these is printed in the first part of the fifteenth volume of Ziletti’s “*Tractatus Illustrium in utraque, tum Pontificii, tum Cæsarei, juris facultate juris consultorum*,” folios 368-378 (printed at Venice in 1583) ; and a full account of the “*Taxæ Sacræ Pœnitentiariæ Apostolicæ*” may be found in the Rev. J. Mendham’s “*Spiritual Venality of Rome*” (London, 1836), and in our article on the Nature and Venality of Papal Indulgences, vol. vii., pp. 138-152. That they have been sold in later times, we have abundant evidence.

In the year 1709, the privateers of Bristol captured a Spanish galleon, on board of which were found five hundred bales of indulgences, which, containing sixteen reams to a bale, were computed to amount to 3,840,000 indulgences. These were to be imposed upon the people, and were to be sold, the lowest at three reals (a little more than twenty pence), but others at fifty pieces of eight (about eight pounds sterling). And Captain Dampier informed Bishop Burnet, who has recorded this fact, that there was such a vast quantity of these indulgences, that the seamen careened their ship with them.*

In the year 1800, a Spanish ship from Europe was captured, near the coast of South America, by Admiral Harvey, then captain of the Southampton frigate. There were on board large bales of paper, valued in her books at 7,500*l*. It was a matter

ecclesiæ exaltatione, hæresium extirpatione, catholicorum principum concordia, et Christiani populi salute, pias ad Deum preces effuderint, PLENISSIMAM OMNIUM PECCATORUM SUORUM INDULGENTIAM, REMISSIONEM, AC VENIAM, misericorditer in Domino concedimus et impertimur.” (*Lettre Encyclique de Nôtre Saint Pere le Pape Leon XII., et Bulle du Jubilé pour 1825*, p. 32. Paris, chez Adrien Le Clerc, imprimeur de N. S. P. le Pape et Mgr. l’Archevêque de Paris, 1824.)

* Burnet’s “*History of the Reformation*,” vol. iii., Introduction, p. xx.

of surprise to him to see them rated so high, and to hear the master of the captured vessel speak of them with great admiration : he examined them, and found them all filled with large sheets of paper, printed, some in Spanish, and some in Latin, but all sealed with the seals of ecclesiastical courts in Spain or at Rome. These were indulgences, or pardons for various sins, and the price, which varied from half a dollar to seven dollars, was marked upon each. *They had been BOUGHT in Spain, and were intended for SALE in South America.* At Tortola, some Dutch merchants bought the whole for 200*l.*, with the hope of being able to smuggle them among the Spaniards in America.*

That indulgences have been sold in IRELAND, and the proceeds thereof applied in AID OF REBELLION *against the lawful sovereign of Great Britain and Ireland*, the following anecdote from the history of the sister island will sufficiently attest. From the evidence communicated before a Committee of the Irish Parliament by Father John Hennesey, it appears that his *Holiness*, Pope Benedict XIII., in compliance with the request of the Romish archbishops and bishops in Ireland (who had conspired, with others of the Romish communion, to exterminate King George II. and the royal family, and to place a Popish Pretender on the throne), issued his bull to facilitate their *pious* intention, and sent them an indulgence for ten years, in order to raise a sum of money to be speedily applied to restore the person calling himself James III. to his pretended right. This bull further enjoined "that every communicant, confessing and receiving upon the patron days of every respective parish, and on any Sunday from the first of May to September, having repeated the Lord's Prayer five times, and once the Apostles' Creed, upon paying *two-pence* each time, was to have a PLENARY INDULGENCE FOR HIS SINS." Under this holy bull, it appears that the sum of *fifteen hundred pounds* sterling was ready to be remitted to the Pretender's agents in Flanders, at the time the treasonable conspiracy was detected by the vigilance of the Irish government.†

In SPAIN, until the late revolution, the sale of indulgences (it is well known) was continued under the pretext of supporting the holy sepulchre at Jerusalem. The documents thus sold were called the Bulla Cruzada. Permission was granted to the purchasers of these bulls (which were vended at four reals each) to eat meat every day in the year, Lent and Fridays included. During the reign of Ferdinand VII. the keepers of the posadas

* Hamilton's "Tracts on some leading Errors of the Church of Rome," p. 68.

† See the Journals of the House of Commons of Ireland, vol. iv., part ii., Appendix, pp. xlv., xlvii. Proceedings on 19th Dec. 1733, fol.

were empowered to require their guests to exhibit their bulls before they sat down to table; and if they refused to produce them, or had eaten meat without being provided with such bulls, they were liable to be fined or imprisoned.*

The late intelligent traveller, Mr. Eustace (a Romish priest), speaking of the notoriously depraved state of morals in ITALY, asks, "May it not be ascribed to the corruptions of the national religion, to the *facility of absolution, and to the EASY PURCHASE OF INDULGENCES?*"† One or two facts will furnish the best answer to this enquiry. "At Tivoli (says Miss Graham, who spent three months in the vicinity of Rome in 1819), a man was pointed out to us who had stabbed his brother, who died in great agonies within an hour. The murderer went to Rome, purchased his pardon from the Church, and received a written protection from a cardinal; in consequence of which he was walking about unconcernedly—a second Cain, whose life was sacred."‡

At Rome, however, the extortion of money by the sale of indulgences does not appear to meet with very great success. Although the higher classes purchase the liberty of eating prohibited meats, in order to maintain a show of obedience to the Church; yet the Romans, generally, "are contented with the indulgences obtained for the trouble of muttering a pater noster, or an ave maria, before the image of some saint, without spending their money to supply luxuries to priests."§

"The Treasure of Grace"—*Il Tesoro di Grazia*, from which we have already cited the doctrine taught at Rome, "*con permesso de' superiori*," contains a catalogue of only one hundred and forty-eight genuine "*indulgences, granted FOR EVER, by the sovereign pontiffs*, to all believers of both sexes." To which are annexed forty prayers, &c., for the recital of which many of these indulgences are granted. At the end of the volume are the imprimaturs of "Fr. V. Modena, O. P. Sacri P. Apostolici Magister Soc.," and of "Ant. Piatti, Archiep. Trapez. Vicesg." As the entire catalogue is too long to admit of translation, our limits will only allow us to offer a short abstract of it to our readers.

* "Six Years in the Monasteries of Italy." By S. J. Mahoney, late a Capuchin friar in the convent of the Immaculate Conception at Rome, p. 294. (Philadelphia, 1836. 12mo.) This writer estimates the money thus extracted from the Spaniards at 500,000 dollars annually, which were transmitted to the Papal treasury, exclusive of what was detained for their trouble by those to whom the sale of indulgences was granted.

† Eustace's "Classical Tour in Italy," vol. iii., p. 342.

‡ "Three Months' Residence in the Mountains East of Rome." By Maria Graham, p. 34. London. 1820. 8vo.

§ Mahoney's "Six Years in the Monasteries of Italy," p. 295.

I. PARTIAL INDULGENCES.

1. *Partial indulgences which may be gained on certain fixed days in the year* :—two, of one hundred days ; five, of three hundred days ; four, of seven years and seven quarantines, or periods of forty days.

2. *Partial indulgences which may be gained once a day* :—two, of forty days ; one, of fifty days ; eighteen, of one hundred days ; one, of two hundred days ; nine, of three hundred days ; one, of seven years and seven quarantines.

3. *Partial indulgences which may be gained several times in the day* :—one, of twenty-five days ; one, of sixty days ; sixteen, of one hundred days ; one, of two hundred days ; six, of three hundred days ; three, of a year ; one, of five years and five quarantines ; six, of seven years and seven quarantines ; one, of ten years and ten quarantines.

II. PLENARY INDULGENCES.

1. *Plenary indulgences which may be gained once in a year* :—three.

2. *Plenary indulgences which may be gained on certain days in the year* :—twenty-two.

3. *Plenary indulgences which may be gained one in the course of a month, on a day to be chosen at pleasure* :—twenty-nine.

4. *Plenary indulgences which may be gained once in a month, on certain days* :—three.

5. *Plenary indulgences which may be gained twice in the month* :—two.

6. *Plenary indulgences which may be gained every day* :—three.

“ In articulo mortis : ”—seven.

One hundred and one of these indulgences are indicated as being applicable to the souls in purgatory.

In the Dublin publication, printed for the so-called Catholic Book Society, the “ indulgences granted by the sovereign pontiffs to the faithful, *who perform the devotions and pious works prescribed,*” are ninety-two in number, and are interspersed among the devotions ; to these are added nine “ plenary indulgences to the faithful of Ireland, besides various plenary and partial indulgences to the ‘ Christian Doctrine and Purgatorian Societies in Ireland : ’ and also for ‘ priests and religious persons ; ’ for ‘ clergymen, secular and regular, who take the sacred oath of the mission ; ’ for the ‘ religious of both sexes ; and for the brothers of the Christian schools. ’ ” The second index to this manual of Romish devotion points out the different prayers, to the recital of which plenary indulgencies—monthly, twice a month, or once in the year—are annexed.

We will now select two or three of the idolatrous prayers addressed to the blessed Virgin Mary, or to so-called saints, for which various indulgences are granted to the credulous votaries of Rome.

Three hundred days' indulgence was granted by Pius VII., by a rescript of the congregation of indulgences, to be obtained once a day by the faithful, who shall recite the following prayer, "with contrite heart," with *salve regina* three times:—

"O Madre di dio, Maria Santissima, quante volte io per gli miei peccati ho meritato l' inferno ! Già la sentenza forse al primo mio peccato sarebbe stata eseguita, se voi pietosa non aveste trattenuto la divina giustizia ; e poi vincendo la mia durezza, mi tiraste a prendere confidenza in Voi. Ed oh ! in quanti altri delitti appresso forse io sarei caduto ne' pericoli che mi sono occorsi, se voi Madre amorosa non me ne aveste preservato colle grazie che mi avete ottenute. Ah ! Regina mia, che mi gioverà la vostra misericordia, ed i favori che mi avete fatto, se io mi danno ? Se un tempo non v' ho amato, ora dopo Dio v' amo sopra ogni cosa. Deh ! non permettete che io abbia a voltare le spalle a voi, e a Dio, che per vostro mezzo tante misericordie mi ha dispensate ! Signora mia amabilissima, non permettete ch' io vi abbia ad odiare e maledire per sempre nell' inferno. Soffrirete voi di veder dannato un vostro servo che v' ama ? O Maria che mi dite ? Io mi dannerò ? Mi dannerò se vi lascio. Ma chi avrà più cuore di lasciarvi ? Chi potrà scordarsi dell' amore che voi mi avete portato ? No, che non si perde chi a voi con fedeltà si raccomanda, e a voi ricorre. Deh ! Madre mia, non mi lasciate in mano mia, che io mi perdere ; fate che io sempre a voi ricorra. Salvate mi, speranza mia, salvatemi dall' inferno, e prima dal peccato, che solo può condannarmi all' Inferno. Tre *Salve Regina*." (*Il Tesoro di Grazia*, pp. 81, 82.)

The following translation of this prayer occurs in the "Dublin Manual of Indulgences," before cited, where it is stated to be one of a series of "prayers to the blessed Virgin Mary for every day in the week, taken from the spiritual works of Saint Alphonsus Liguori;" and it is further added that the same Pope "granted a plenary indulgence, once a month, to those who daily recite these prayers for a month," according to his intentions, "provided they confess and approach the holy communion on any day of the month chosen by themselves, and pray for the Holy Catholic Church, and for the other pious intentions." (p. 116.)

"A Prayer for Wednesday.

"O Mother of God, most sacred Mary, how often have I deserved to be condemned to hell for my sins. Already that sentence would have, perhaps, been carried into effect after my first sin, hadst not thou graciously withheld the divine justice, and, having overcome my obstinacy, invited me to have confidence in thee. And oh ! how many other sins would I afterwards have fallen into, amidst the dangers which came in my way, if thou, dearest Mother, hadst not preserved

me by the graces thou didst obtain for me. Ah, powerful Mother,* merciful Mother, what will thy mercy avail me, and the favours thou hast obtained for me, if I damn myself? If there were a time that I did not love thee, I declare at present that I love thee, after God, above all things. Ah! do not permit me ever to turn my back on thee and on my God, who, through thy intercession, has heaped upon me so many favours. O my most amiable Lady, do not permit that I be doomed to hate and to curse thee for ever in hell. Couldst thou bear to see among the damned thy servant, who loves thee? O Mary, what dost thou say to me? Shall I damn myself? I shall indeed damn myself, if I abandon thee. But who can still have a heart capable of abandoning thee? Who could ever forget that love which thou hast borne unto me? No, he cannot be lost, who commends himself with confidence to thy care, and runs to thy protection. Ah! my Mother, do not leave me to myself, or I shall be lost. Grant that I may always have recourse to thee. Save me, O my hope; save me from hell; and first from sin, which alone can condemn me to hell.

“*The Hail, Mary, three times.*” (*Ibid.* p. 119, 120.)

On referring to page 47 supra, the reader will see that three hundred days’ indulgence is granted for reciting three aspirations to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph—the last of whom is actually addressed as if he were a deity!

“60th Indulgence.—An offering of ourselves to the protection of the blessed Virgin Mary.—By a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, dated the 11th of August, 1824, Leo XII. confirmed for ever the indulgence of one hundred days, already granted, in 1804, by Pius VII., to the faithful, who say devoutly, and with contrite heart, the following prayers; and by rescript of the said Congregation, dated the 10th of May, 1828, he granted a hundred additional days of indulgence to the recital of them: so that an indulgence of two hundred days may be gained by practising this devotion.

“O most holy Virgin, Mother of the Word incarnate, depositary of graces, and refuge of us, miserable sinners, we have recourse to thy maternal love with a lively faith, and we ask the grace to do always the will of God, and thine. We resign ourselves into thy most sacred hands, and *beg of thee to save us, soul and body.* We confidently hope that thou, O most loving Mother, wilt graciously hear us; and therefore with a lively faith we say—Hail, Mary.

“Protect, we beseech thee, O Lord, thy servants from every frailty, by the intercession of the blessed Virgin Mary; and while we prostrate ourselves before thee with our whole hearts, mercifully preserve us from the snares of our enemies: through Christ, our Lord. Amen.” (*Ibid.* p. 125).

What epithet but that of blasphemy can be applied to such prayers as these?

Our readers cannot but have observed how the Romish Church

* The original Italian is “Ah! Regina mia”—Ah! my Queen.

regards indulgences as a means of obtaining money. Mr. Palmer has examined the subject of indulgences at considerable length in his second, third, and fourth Letters to Dr. Wiseman, which demonstrate that the Romish doctrine concerning satisfactions is utterly unsupported by Scripture or Christian antiquity. We commend these Letters to the attentive study of all who are desirous of investigating this subject. They are written in an excellent spirit, and are characterized by patient research and clear and cogent arguments, which Romanists may endeavour to evade, but which they will not be able *fairly* to refute.

ART. IV.—*Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians.*
 Second Series. By Sir J. G. WILKINSON, F.R.S. 2 vols.,
 and a volume of Plates. London: Murray. 1841.

THERE are few subjects that appear to attract deeper public interest than the various publications that relate to Egypt, which, whether viewed in its ancient or modern position, seems equally destined to command for ever an undying memory. Clot Bey and Rüppell, however they vary with respect to the character of its present ruler, both combine to give the knowledge of modern Egypt additional extension to her ancient glory; and the sale of such publications as that noticed at the head of this article proves the attention with which the interests of that country are viewed. The siege of St. Jean d'Acre has also, from its vicinity, recently drawn fresh attention to the pasha; and though this murderer of the Mamelukes (in spite of all the glossing of Clot Bey) may have thrown around him a high prestige, from his superior intellectuality to the Porte and its present rulers, still no one can close his eyes as to the exactions demanded of the wretched Fellahs of the land of the Pharaohs. Its archæology is equally interesting, it would appear, with its modern history. The judicious productions of Pococke and Hamilton, together with the great work dedicated to that leviathan, Napoleon, and the Travels of Denon, which led the way, have been followed up by Burchardt, a Sheik Ibrahim, Belzoni, Champollion, and Captain Light; and, lastly, the mantle has fallen on a worthy successor to their fame, and a formidable rival to all, in a gentleman equally distinguished in the drawing-room and among the dilettanti, Sir J. G. Wilkinson. There is possibly but one person (Mr. Bankes) who is capable of imparting to us views of *equal* or superior accuracy; and from his immense materials, the product of years of

laborious research, we feel deep regret that anything should have proved a stumbling-block in our access to the immense digest made by him, and which we anticipated would long since have seen the light. We trust also that Government will purchase the Egyptian remains in the possession of Athanasi, the materials of which will be put into requisition in the continuance of our researches, in the difficult elucidation of the hieroglyphics, begun in this country by Young, continued by Champollion and Rosellini, and at present prosecuting by Leemans, Birch, and other Coptic scholars, here and on the continent. Even remote Russia feels across the Steppes the enkindling influence of these subjects; and though M. Goulianoff is quite wrong in his entire view of hieroglyphics, any work on them, from that country, may be considered as a fair proof of their surpassing interest. The prices demanded by Athanasi, though high, should be given at once, for the loss of these remains can never be recovered.

We much fear that what will yet reach us from Egypt will fall far short of what we have within our grasp, and but little remains to render our collection the most unique in the world. Messrs. Salt, Burton, and Athanasi, have all offered to this country, in the first instance, their valuable collections. Such collections can never again be formed, and we shall deeply regret if that of Athanasi, which combines a large portion of Mr. Salt's, is suffered to quit this country.—Sir G. Wilkinson, though probably not equally distinguished as an hieroglyphic scholar with some others in England, yet has contributed more than all to the popular view of the question, and is an ardent believer in the truth of the phonetic and ideographic system. We shall now proceed to the consideration of the work before us. It forms the second series of the “Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians,” and it closes their history by accompanying them through their habits, usages, life, and religion, to the tomb. In his Preface, our author does not view his work—in fact, what work can be?—as the conclusion to the wondrous tale of ancient Egypt, but as the initiative process to the clearer development of deeper and fuller mysteries yet to be revealed, when the deep lore of the Egyptian is read in his own singular language, and every phonetic and ideographic character comes out into clearer light. On this subject he expresses himself fully and clearly:—

“In offering any remarks on so abstruse and mysterious a subject as the religion of the Egyptians, I must observe that my view has been rather to present the result of observations derived from the monuments than to suggest my own opinion respecting it, *feeling persuaded that the progress of discovery in hieroglyphical literature will at length ex-*

plain the doctrines of that people without the necessity of unsatisfactory and doubtful conjecture. Whatever statements I have ventured to make are open to correction, and await the sentence of more matured opinions derived from the experience of future discoveries." (Preface, p. vi.)

Equally judicious and explicit is he also in alluding to that mighty subject, the analogy of all religions, which would form a most striking article for the present Review, and which we throw forth as an idea to our contributors, that they may ripen it into rich production:—

"Striking analogies will be found in most religions which appear to connect them with each other, and which, by proclaiming a common origin at a most remote period, tend, like the discoveries in language and modern investigations, to point out the important truths of the Mosaical history of the world." (Preface, p. v.)

The work, as we have already observed, is to be viewed as a sequel to the former productions of our author, and he commences it with an account of Egypt, as an agricultural country. Other countries have their rich and irrigated lands, but in no country is there the advantage provided for Egypt, of a river whose singular rise covers the entire surface of the land around it annually, and which has continued in this immovable characteristic from generation to generation. The habits produced by this are, of course, as ancient as they are permanent; and probably Egypt has, in many points, varied the least of the nations of the earth. That shepherd race that were among the earliest herds of Egypt were probably tempted thither by the far-famed reports of the richness of her soil; the Persian, Macedonian, Roman, followed; lastly, the Arab and the Turk; terminating in the Hybrid sovereignty of the present pasha. Yet, during the period of 1,200 years, from the reign of Osirtesen to the Persian conquest, Egypt remained under one magnificent dynasty in unshaken power. Her resources must have been immense, since she maintained 7,000,000 of inhabitants, supported an army of 410,000, besides auxiliaries, and was evidently then making deep inroads into Asia and Africa; though, singular to say, neither her works in art nor her deities appear to have ever penetrated Abyssinia. Her superiority, as an agricultural country, led naturally to the possession of high manufacturing skill. All nations that excel in the one will be found to make the other a meet handmaid; and no one who investigates the sources of power—save the mad wretch who seeks to traitorously disunite this land, in the vain hope of making himself the lord of a part of it, with that crew that hark on to the same frantic chorus—can doubt that a land that is highly agricultural will be found to be necessarily

manufacture. Both these classes are dependent on each other; their prosperity cannot be severed: the fertility of the soil will aid the fertility of invention, and will furnish the inventive powers with their means of application. To point out the excellence of Egypt in her manufacture, whether of the precious metals, gems, porcelain, cotton and woollen, glass and linen, were needless. Her wonders are developed to us in our Museum, exhibiting skill that both astonishes and delights. To the peculiar position of ancient Egypt the rise of geometry, as the only plan of ascertaining the limits of the inundated soil, is traceable. The Nilometer was an instrument for measuring the rise and fall of the waters of their river; officers also were to superintend them; priests, who traced mysterious influences in nature's forces, followed. There was, too, another science which the Nile necessarily added to mensuration—astronomy. The heliacal rising of Sirius coincided with the annual rising of the river. This led to many conjectures on a mysterious connection between the star and the river, and the Egyptian soon converted the science of mensuration to purposes of a sublimer character. It is by no means improbable that the Nile then contributed to render the Egyptian exact in his measurement of time, and especially of his year. It is a singular fact, and one of which our author has well availed himself, that the hieroglyphics are anterior to the solar year: since the hieroglyphic for *month* is the crescent of the moon, as Horapollo and the sculptures indicate. The earliest change of the Egyptian year was to make it solar.

The Egyptian next intercalated to ensure the return of his seasons at fixed periods. Five days were his first, and they were added at the end of Mesore, his last month, to the solar year of 360 days. This was soon found an inefficient and inexact expedient; for although it required 1,460 years for the seasons to recede through the twelve months, yet it must have been soon apparent that the rise of the Nile was no longer at the computed period, and that in one hundred and twenty years a month difference had ensued, and that the peasant's occupation then no longer agreed with the scientific computation. They, therefore, added a quarter of a day to remedy this defect, making every fourth year consist of 366 days. It is not improbable, also, that the sidereal year of Sirius agreed with the solar. We see, however, how curiously in these matters the position of the Egyptian, like that of the Chaldean, contributed to his astronomical skill. Nor did his skill, in effect, stop there; he was even led to the extension of his geometric powers in those wonderful monuments, the pyramids, tombs of the kings, and temples. In the structure of

these the immense fertility of the soil was no mean auxiliary. Egypt, like Sicily, was the granary of surrounding countries.

Of her varied methods of tillage, the work before us furnishes graphical illustration of very high merit, to which we refer our readers. The dressing of the soil, the various kinds of corn, the months for sowing and reaping, are given with the same accuracy as though they were rules for every day labour, and the work were, as in sound so in sense, a gardener's manual.

The plants of the desert amount to about two hundred and fifty species. The whole Egyptian herbarium consists of about thirteen hundred. The desert plants may be considered nearly all indigenous; and of the entire herbarium, few are possessed by other countries. While upon this subject we may as well notice the singular vitality possessed by the corn found in the tombs, which, though buried for probably nearly 2,000 years, has been found to retain even the power of germination. The trees of Egypt next follow, with an account of her valuable woods and medicinal barks.

The harvest-home of the Egyptian is then presented to us, with as much vividness as though it were our own. The singular song of the threshers, which Champollion deciphered, the reaping, the treading of the corn by the oxen, are all exhibited, both in modern and ancient practice, singularly conformable to each other. But all these labours depended for high crops entirely on a favourable inundation: the peasant watched its course with deep anxiety. About the middle of June a gradual and continuous rise was observable. From its previously clear state it becomes red and turbid, from the Abyssinian mountains. These changes are probably the cause, as Sir G. Wilkinson conjectures, of the representation of the god Nilus both of a red and blue colour. In the beginning of August the canals that branch off from the Nile are opened, and the waters fill them and the plains. According to Strabo, a good Nile inundation must be fourteen cubits; but according to Pliny, if the Nile exceeded sixteen, a famine was the result. The Nile, according to him, rose eighteen cubits in the reign of Claudius: he is not, however, quite consistent with himself. Is the inundation at present similar to the ancient, in point of actual height? may be naturally demanded. Apparently it is so. The rise, however, of the bed of the river is a necessary consequence of the inundations. The Nilometer at Elephantine, in its highest scale, now does not equal an ordinary inundation. The obelisk of Heliopolis and the colossi of the plain, attest, by alluvial deposit, the same fact. The whole of the towns of Egypt will, therefore, probably need constant elevation. After the interval

of six hundred years, from Sesostris to Sabaco, the change in the levels rendered it necessary to elevate the town then, as Sesostris had previously done. The land about Elephantine has been raised, in 1,700 years, nine feet : at Thebes, seven. Sir G. Wilkinson, in a memoir sent to the Geographical Society, has taken great pains to establish this rise of alluvial soil very clearly. In the colossi of the plain, which are forty-seven feet high, and with the pedestal sixty, the alluvial soil has accumulated around them to the height of from six to seven feet ; so that they now stand only fifty-three feet above the level of the plain. By excavating to the base of the pedestal, and having penetrated beneath it, he found that it stood not on alluvial ground, but on the soil of the desert, which was based with sandstone blocks, serving as substruction for the colossus and the dromos of the temple, in a level with which dromos the statues are placed. With considerable ingenuity Sir G. Wilkinson proceeded to investigate whether the slope of the *dromos* corresponded with that of the desert. A group of statues discovered by him gave the accumulation of the alluvial deposit at five feet three inches. From these facts our ingenious traveller deduces, that, in a distance of three hundred feet, a difference of from one foot seven inches to one foot nine inches, or an average of twenty inches in three hundred feet, or a decreasing ratio of one inch in fifteen feet, must be allowed for the talus of the sloping desert on which they are placed. He infers also, from the same facts, that all the deposit now existing between the colossi and the edge of the desert behind the temple, a total distance of one thousand nine hundred feet, has been brought there since the reign of the third Amunoph, whose effigies they represent, or within 3,260 years. In similar manner to the above our author puts down the extravagant notion, that the encroachments of the sand bid fair to annihilate Egypt. According to him the number of square miles of inundated arable soil is much greater than at previous periods. The

“ Fell simoom,
That harbinger of death and gloom,”

is not so dreadful as represented ; and he speaks of the endurance, not of one, but of many, with considerable calmness. The following passage we extract for its simple elegance of description :—

“ A remarkable feature in the valley of Egypt, which must strike every one who crosses the edge of the alluvial land, is the line of demarkation between this and the desert, which is so strongly defined that you may almost step with one foot upon the richest, and with the other on the most barren land ; for, as Strabo says, ‘ all is sterile in Egypt

where the Nile does not reach, but it only requires to be irrigated by the fertilizing water of the river to become productive, as the flower of the female plant only awaits the pollen of the male to cause it to produce'—an idea analogous to the fable of Osiris (as the inundation) approaching the bed of Isis (the soil it irrigates), or, more properly, of Nephtis (the barren land); who also produced a son on being visited by Osiris." (Vol. i., p. 120).

No wonder was it, with effects so visible and palpable before him, that the Egyptian celebrated with joy the inundation period. Yet, though the tillage of the soil was honourable, the pastors of flocks and swineherds were held in especial abomination. Josephus is clearly wrong in the assertion, that "the Egyptians were prohibited to meddle with the feeding of sheep." All the sculptures contradict him, and prove that they had numerous flocks and herds, and that native Egyptians tended them.

Something like veterinary surgery seems to have been in use, since Cuvier found the left humerus of a mummied ibis fractured and re-united in a particular manner, proving the intervention of human art. The principle of artificial incubation lately exhibited in the Eccaleobion to the public was of extreme antiquity. Our author gives the process, and a diagram of the oven. Thus does the scriptural assertion, that "there is nothing new under the sun," become illustrated even in Egypt; and we shall, towards the close of this article, show that few discoveries, however apparently unique and modern, were unknown to this singular and wonderful nation.

We next proceed to the vast Pantheon of Egypt, a subject that startles the mind and bewilders the imagination—a subject on which, if we cannot arrive at the conclusions of the Roman satirist on this head, yet, at least, it is difficult not to participate in them in some degree, though the astounding excellence of the Egyptian in art and manufactures is scarcely reconcilable with his degraded theology. We shall have occasion to revert to this subject more fully, and shall examine the force of the argument of Mr. T. Carlyle, who, though he has found no Egyptians worthy of his hero-worship, still this is only from a want of deeper acquaintance with their history common to us all, and we shall give his "benign interpretatio" of "something good in all false worship" full consideration. The favourite theory urged for the Egyptian would of course be Pantheistic life. According to this theory, whatever is, or has been manifested, is deity. But the Egyptian, in common with the Israelite, sacrificed animals; and certainly heroes *received no funeral honours* from them. Divination by omens and oracles prevailed to as great an extent

as in Greece ; and the oracle of Ammon enjoyed for ages the highest celebrity, and it lasted when Delphi had become dumb. The theory of Porphyry, that the Egyptians considered animals either to be really deities, or represented them as gods, with the figures of oxen, birds, and other creatures, in order that the people might not eat them, and probably from a metempsychosis principle, is not tenable ; first, because the Egyptians *did* eat the animals in question ; and next, because the representation in this manner would have degraded his gods : whereas the Egyptian principle appears to have been to indicate the divine omnipresence by combinations of the Deity with everything. The lively Greek, of course, did not lose the advantage of numerous witty sallies against them ; and, to say the truth, his own worship, though borrowed, was at least partially purified from the dregs of the source from which it sprung. Still it must be admitted that a reason of some character, which at present escapes us, must have been anciently given for these singular usages. It is also perfectly apparent that the god-descent of the Greeks derived no colour from Egyptian usages : so that here the latter appear more rational than their imitators ; for though there are offerings by kings, as by other persons, to their deceased parents, these are only made to them in the character they assumed after death, when they received the name of Osiris, from clearly something like a Pantheistic principle, supposing the soul to return to the source from whence it emanated. Singularly enough, and unaccountably enough also, the king even offers to a figure of himself and his queen, seated on thrones, before whom he stands as an officiating priest. Neither does it appear that the Egyptian held, like the Hindoo, and the Israelite, and the Greek, a pure theory of a personal manifestation of the Deity upon earth. It is quite clear, from the singular forms of Egyptian divinities, that they never could be other than an attempt to figure excellencies in nature, or abstract ideas of something not easily represented in any other form, or any, at least, not equally mysterious, unless veiled under this semblance. It is also, we think, quite evident that there were great gods, who appear with attributes, or rather as attributes ; and others were, like the Titanic Æschylean divinities, representations of physical objects. Sir G. Wilkinson justly remarks that this notion (of which we get a lively illustration in the “ Prometheus Vinctus ”) of calling attributes, gods, such as a god of strength, and claiming descent from *strength*, must have excited equally ridiculous notions of Greek theosophy in the Egyptian. Egypt threw into her system all the affections, qualities, states, conditions, and sciences ; even divisions of the day became emblems. Unable, without the

magic of the Greek chisel, to convey distinct physiognomy to their gods—as that nation stamped for ever its Apollo, its Hercules, its Jupiter, its Minerva, and its Venus—they adopted the combinations from the inferior kingdoms of nature. The Memnon, in our Museum, and many other statues of the divinities, which appear with varying and singularly expressive physiognomies, particularly the Pthah, were probably the work of Greeks; for the earlier statues give but one unvarying representation of the “human face divine.” The Greeks did not forget much of this mystic lore of Egypt, and their Charon, Fauns, Pan, and Satyrs, are clear modifications of the Egyptian system, enhanced into superior beauty by their skill in the plastic art. The great and supreme God is possibly never represented in the Egyptian remains; his form with them, as his name and form with the Hebrews, is unutterable and inexpressible. Osiris, though, like Vishnou, an avatar and judge of the dead in the region of Amenti, is not to be looked on as the Deity in unity. Can the Triad principle, and also the Incarnation, which the avatars develope, be resolved into anything else than one great master idea of the universal mind, which truth alone suggested, and from which no nation is without some trace? The great gods of the Egyptians were Neph, Amun, Pthah, Khem, Saté, Maut, or perhaps Buto, Bubastis, and Neith. Each one of these generally, in combination with two others, formed a triad, which was worshipped by a particular locality. There is also in these a clear procession of one member from the other two. It cannot also be denied—which interferes with the great principle of co-equality and co-eternity—that very often these higher deities are united with some inferior divinity. Our author adverts, and justly, to the keeping of all antiquity with the tone of the holy Scriptures, and justly treats the argument derived from the first verse of the book of Genesis as of considerable grammatical weight in favour of this matter. The same singular connection which is exhibited between the Creator and Creative Spirit, who is called “the Spirit of truth” in the New Testament, is also observable; and equally singular is the analogy between Osiris and the Christ. After performing a series of manifestations, full of goodness and truth, in the discharge of his duties on earth, Osiris falls a victim to the machinations of Typho, the evil one, and then assumes the office, in a future state, of judge of mankind. This great idea of a future state—of an immortality of the soul—is demonstrably of 2,000 years before our era; since Osiris, as judge of the Amenti, occurs on the tombs of the kings who were contemporary with the erectors of the pyramids. But a brief sketch of the ensuing portions of

the work, from this part, commencing with the eight great gods enumerated above, and passing through the various other divinities and sacred objects, we trust will not prove uninteresting.

We shall commence with *Neph*, a divinity that is clearly correspondent with the Creative Spirit. *Neph* is usually represented with the ram's head, occasionally surmounted by the asp or vase, which last, as an hieroglyphic, was the initial of his name. The Jupiter Ammon of the Romans and Greeks is a similar mistake with the representation of Anubis as a dog-headed deity—an error which has been perpetuated on stone in the term Ammonite, from the curvature downwards of the sheep's horn. The ram-headed deity never had the name of Amun, except when represented with the attributes of *Neph*, a case of rare occurrence. *Neph* and Amun must not be confounded; the latter must not receive the head of the ram, but the former. The asp, the type of dominion, was sacred to this deity. Princes when reigning wore it, but were not permitted to use it anterior to the assumption of sovereignty. Many parts of the royal dress were ornamented with the same emblem, and the "asp" formed crowns of the Rosetta stone were exclusively regal. Cleopatra, dying by the bite of this animal, fell by a kingly symbol. It is a singular fact that Champollion has indicated that the name *uræus*, given to this animal, probably derives its origin from the Coptic *ouro*, a king, answering to the word *Βασιλικοῦ*, "royal," from whence our term *basilisk* is derived.

Neph forms, with Saté (Juno) and Anouké (Vesta), one of the great triads of Egypt. His emblem, the ram, became one of those amulets used as ornaments by the devout, and his worship pervaded nearly the whole of Ethiopia. *Neph* receives the downward curving horns of the sheep, and also the long projecting horns, which, by confusion with those of the goat, have caused some difficulty in the hieroglyphical names of the Cæsars, both being supposed to represent the same animal, and also to stand for the letters *b* and *s*. The sheep or ram's horn, however, had clearly the alphabetic value of *s*, Trajanus, and the goat's *b* or *v*, as in Tiberius, Severus, and Sebastus.

Amun, or Amun-Re. This deity ranks second to *Neph*; not from any superiority of *Neph*, but because that deity is the oldest in Upper Egypt; and if the notion of *Neph*, above enumerated, be correct, as the Creative Spirit, he may claim this rank justly. Amun is also exhibited in the triad form: his figure is in general that of a man, with a head-dress surmounted by long feathers; his colour light blue. He is not figured with the head of a ram, or under the form of a ram; neither must we infer his inferiority to Osiris from the fact that he is represented sacrificing to that

deity. Osiris, as judge of the Amenti, holds a rank above all the gods of Egypt, from being the president of undivulged mysteries; and, as the system which we are developing treats all these gods as attributes, there appears no reason why one attribute should not yield to another without derogating from its dignity. Even in our own parlance we speak at times of justice yielding to mercy; and probably the Egyptian meant nothing more, though he might have been a little less complicated in expression, in mercy to future generations, to whom his mythology has become a somewhat dark affair, and bothered alike both ancients and moderns. Amun is an appellation to which etymology can yield no light; but in the great triad, at Thebes, of Amun, Maut, and Khonso, our author conjectures that they may represent the demiurge intellect, mother, and created things. Amun, in the legends of Thebes, receives the title of "King of the Gods." The Libyan oracle, according to Herodotus, was derived from the Thebais; but Herodotus falls into the general error of his mystified countrymen in supposing the deity of Thebes to be ram-headed, for which all that can be pleaded in his behalf is, that, as has been stated above, Amun sometimes assumes the character of Neph—nay, is even hawk-headed in one instance; so that he might have been as reasonably affirmed to be Osiris as Neph. This, however, only occurs as a member of the triad, of which Amun was the chief.

We now proceed to Pthah, or Vulcan. The distinction between this deity and Neph consists in this, that Neph is the Spirit of God which moved upon the waters; and Pthah, which is the creative power itself, is equal to Neph, but distinct in agency. We find Pthah generally accompanied, at Thebes, by Justice, or Truth, a figure with a single ostrich feather, and bearing the title of *Lord of Truth*. Does this bear any analogy to the sublime language in which Wisdom is represented as the eternal attendant of God before the mountains were brought forth; so exquisitely given in Proverbs viii. 22? To Pthah are ascribed four offices: first, creator of the universe generally; second, creator of the world we inhabit; third, the creator of all animal and vegetable life; fourth, the creator of mankind. Dim traces of this last character appear even in the degraded Vulcan of the Greeks. The formation of Pandora, and the application of fire to make man by, Prometheus, as given in "Apollodorus," would appear to indicate that the fire god was something higher in power, in the spring of his character, than the smith of Lesbos. The works attributed to Vulcan partake of the highest creative character, as the figures, instinct with life, described as his workmanship, would also indicate. His Greek appellation of He-

phæstion, derived by Phurnutus, “*απο τῆ ηφθαλ*,” signifying *to burn*, which contains the radicals of Pthah, traces out a clear analogy. Pthah is generally in the form of a mummy, with the emblems of life and stability, and the staff of purity, which last emblem is common to all the gods, and to many of the goddesses, of Egypt. The ordinary head-dress of Pthah, when in his usual form, the mummy shape, is a close plain cap; but occasionally he wears the lofty ostrich plume of Osiris, and the plain staff of purity, with no other emblems. The figures of Pthah are among the most exquisite specimens of Egyptian art. The deity worshipped at Memphis, Pthah-Sokari-Osiris, from his deformity, is a far closer approach to the Greek Vulcan than the really beautiful figures before alluded to.

We next have *Khem*, the generative principle, another deified attribute. From being represented in general with the flagellum, the Romans probably assigned to Priapus the office of presiding over gardens. The Hermes figures, placed on the public roads, were probably also borrowed from Egypt. The name of Egypt, Khemi, is remarkable for its analogy to the name of this divinity; and the Hebrew כְּנַעַן, written Kham, or Khem, is that which the Egyptians themselves give to the country, though the Bible calls it Mizraim, a dual, referring to two divisions. This agrees with the modern appellation, *Misr*, but is not found in the hieroglyphics.

We now proceed to Saté or Juno, Saturnia. This goddess, however, does not discharge the same splendid offices with the *regina cæli*. She is represented as a female figure, wearing on her head the cap or crown of the upper country, from which project the horns of a cow, and the usual sceptre of Egyptian goddesses is in her hand.

Maut, mother, is the next. Though many divinities receive the appellation of mother goddesses, from the term Maut being especially given to this one, Sir G. Wilkinson conceives she represents *Nature*. The vulture in her hieroglyphics indicates maternity. Maut is usually represented as a female figure, wearing the pshent, or double crown, placed upon a cap ornamented with the head, body, and wings of a vulture.

Pasht, *Bubastis*, or *Diana*. This is the divinity usually represented with the head of a lioness or a cat; and to her the latter was peculiarly sacred. The uræus, or royal asp, rises from a disk over her head. The idea of Juvenal does not appear to us so absurd as to Sir G. Wilkinson:—

“*Oppida tota canem veneratur nemo Dianam.*”

If the description in Herodotus be correct, of the rites cele-

brated in honour of this goddess, and the practice *peu chaste* alluded to in ii. 60, by the word *ανασυρονται*, they ill resembled the description of Laertes—

“The choicest maid is prodigal enough,
If she unmask her beauty to the *moon*.”

We have only another of the Deæ Majores—Neith-Minerva. With respect to the name of this goddess, it has been conjectured that *Athena* was derived from the Greek mode of writing *Neth* or *Neith*: the Egyptians writing from right to left, the Greeks from left to right. The representation of *Neth* is as a female wearing the crown of the lower country, holding the flower-headed sceptre of the goddesses; sometimes the accompaniment of Dian, the bow and arrows; and, according to Proclus, she was equally the goddess of learning and war. With her we close these brief notices of the Dii Majores, and pass to the Dii Minores; and amid these the first is *Re* or *Ra*, *Helios*, the *sun*—a name to which, when the definite article *Pi* was prefixed, it was the same as *Phrah*, or the Pharaoh of Scripture. This god we conceive is the same with the Syrian Baal or Lord, and his worship was at Heliopolis. Here the fabled phoenix was supposed to have his abode; though Herodotus had no notion, similar to that entertained afterwards, that it rose from its ashes. We dissent entirely, however, from the idea that this bird is mentioned in Job xxix. 18, to which Sir G. Wilkinson inclines, and are quite certain that nothing false, physically or philosophically, appears in the Bible, save in instances of clear adaptation to the common sense of nations, or to things as they seem to our organs. The passage in question in the LXX., in the Vatican Exemplar, now before us, reads—Ἡ ἡλικία μου γηράσει ὡς τὸ στέλεχος φοινίκος—“My age shall increase like the trunk of the *palm*.” Our version gives it, “I shall multiply my days as the *sand*,” with which sense of חֵן *sand* numerous passages agree. A few rabbinical vagaries on this subject are of no consequence. Had Gesenius inclined to this interpretation, it would not have surprised us, as he loves out of the way notions of passages; but in both Lexicon and Commentary he appears to condemn it, though Sir G. Wilkinson states him to favour it. “Interpretes Hebræi *Phœnicem* avem intelligunt ex altero membro, conjecturam facientes: Codd. Babyl. legunt חֵן sed non est quod a vulgari significatione recedamus.” Passing Seb and Netpe, the parents of Osiris, who are quite lost in his beams, we come to that most embarrassing and singular divinity himself. Herodotus seems reluctant to name him, from reverential motives. His principal functions are judgment over the souls of

the dead, and rule over Elysium. Enthroned with Isis and Nepthys, with the four Genii of the Amenti, who stand on the lotus, implying birth from water, he receives, like Radamanthus, the records of past life written by Thoth, as a recording angel. Horus brings the dead man into his presence with the awful tablet of Thoth, after his actions have been weighed in the scales of truth. Men and women, after death, receive the name of Osiris : and the papyri completely develope the doctrine of the metempsychosis, an opinion afterwards introduced by Pythagoras into Greece.

The singular legends connected with the death of Osiris cannot, from the nature of their details, be inserted here ; and we pass on to the *Apis*. According to Diodorus—but Greeks are poor authorities on Egypt—the soul of Osiris migrated into this animal. The cost for the support of him during life, his expensive burial, and his no less expensive embalming, are certainly to us as unintelligible as mysterious. Omens were supposed to be given by his reception or rejection of food. The latter was thought so sinister, that it was supposed his refusal of food from the hand of Germanicus portended the destruction of that prince. His choice of one of his two stables also indicated national benefits, or the reverse. We shall next consider Isis : but, with all due consideration, we cannot credit the far-fetched astronomical theory attempted to be drawn as to her and Osiris. We believe the alteration of the calendar effected by Cæsar arose mainly from Egypt after his visit to Alexandria, and we think the notion fairly borne out that it was so derived ; but we never could believe the artificial system of explaining the singular tales of Osiris and Isis by astronomy : it is too refined for the period ; though we do not affect to deny side-real worship to be largely connected with the hieroglyphics. Isis is sister and wife of Osiris, and the papyri represent her as attending him as judge of the dead. Throughout the whole of Egypt the affinity with the Eleusinian mysteries is very remarkable. Her principal temple was at Philæ. She is repeatedly represented with the water plants rising from her head, in addition to the horns of Athor and the globe. Athor is the Egyptian Venus : she is frequently, however, figured under the form of the cow. This goddess answers to the Greek Io, and not Isis, as many have supposed. The head of Athor is the most beautiful specimen of Egyptian art. The analogy between the worship of the cow here, as well as in India, would lead us to the conclusion of a common source of error, arising in the Israelitish and Syrian corruptions. Horus, her son, who is distinct from another Horus, the brother of Osiris, is identified with Apollo

by the victory over the serpent, that tremendous primal truth; which, whether we run even to the legends of the Scalds and Runes, is equally apparent with the record of Moses, its unquestionable origin. The coil of Midgard around the world, the battering of Thor to make him release his prey—what allegory could inspire these things but the one great truth recorded by the Jewish legislator? Vishnou represents it equally. How singularly is Horus identified with Apollo, as born in an isle, the sport of the waves until his birth—a floating isle, like Delos, raised for this purpose; and how does this connect these deities with Titanic origin, since their birth is from forces of nature! How singularly does Delos illustrate the whole of the Cycladæ, which rose in the same manner from volcanic action, like the Sabrina which appeared off St. Michael's for a few days, on which a ship's company landed, planted an union-jack, and to their astonishment saw it vanish on the morrow. The birth of Horus is the victory of order over disorder; his birth is the downfall of Typhon, or disorder, or evil; the sun and moon are his eyes, from which spring order and the seasons; and his office of Psychopompos, in common with Anubis, to the blissful region of Amenti, strongly resembles that of Mercury. Passing Hor-phocrat, and the elder Horus, and others, just briefly alluding to the singular analogy of one *Ehoou, the day*, with *Eos*, we proceed to the consideration of Ombte, or the evil being, who answers to the Greek description of Typho, though Sir G. Wilkinson considers him distinct from this deity. The Egyptians looked upon the evil being as one whom it was necessary to honour, as being part of the divine economy of the universal system. Great care has been taken to erase his image from numerous ancient monuments: this proves that a change of sentiment had taken place on this question among the Egyptians. To Sir G. Wilkinson's note (vol. i., p. 427) we beg leave to add some important points. "Typhon (or Typhoon) was applied to a sudden whirlwind in former times (Plin. ii. 48), as at the present day; and Tuphán is the Arabic name of the deluge." Not only so, but Typhon means also a *comet* and *sea water*, and it is well known that to the Egyptian *sea water* was unclean. May we not consider *the deluge*, or a partial deluge of the country, to have been occasioned, according to Egyptian notions, by the approach of a comet too near to the earth?

The theory of ill omens, according to the great current notion connected with these bodies by the ancients, however erroneous, still is not without some foundation, or connection with something true; and that an inundation of the waters of the sea deluged Egypt, which recognized, in this unusual approach, the

presence of the malignant Typhon, that would deprive them of the benefits of Osiris (the Nile), appears by no means improbable. Certainly all Typhonic appellations appear singularly Titanic, and relate to the actions of powerful physical agents. With the treatment of one other deity we shall close the first volume—*Anubis*. The “*Latrator Anubis*” is very famous among both Greeks and Romans, but no such character is possessed by the genuine Anubis. He has the head of a *jackal*, and not of a *dog*. Anubis is one of the principal deities of Amenti. His office is to superintend the departure of the soul, which is figured by a small bird, with human head and hands, holding the sign of life and a sail, the symbol of transmigration or passage from the body. We refer our readers to plate 44 for this affecting illustration, where the character of Anubis appears most benevolent. How singular a figure !

With this mention of Anubis we proceed to the second volume, in which our stay need not be so protracted as with the first. Thoth, the god of letters, next occupies observation. He is the scribe of the dead, similar to the recording angel of Sterne. We find the cynocephalus an equivalent to this deity, and repeatedly holding his tablet, as in plate 45. Thoth is the Ibis-headed deity so common on the sculptures. On the reasons for the worship of the Ibis we profess our ignorance, as the serpent-killing quality is not sufficient, in our ideas, for this veneration. Thoth, as the Egyptian Mercury, is supposed to be the patron of letters. This deity is distinct from the Hermes Trismegistus, of whose books Clemens Alexandrinus gives this description :—

“ The principal books of this Hermes, forty-two in number, were treated by the Egyptians with profound respect, and carried in their religious processions. First came the singer, holding two in his hand—one containing hymns to the gods, the other certain rules for the conduct of the monarch. Next to him the horoscope, whose duty was to recite the four books of astrology, one of which treated of the fixed stars, another of solar and lunar eclipses, and the remaining two of the rising of the sun and moon. Ten books contained those things which related to the gods and the religion of Egypt—as sacrifices, first-fruits, hymns, prayers, processions, holy days, and the like. Last of all came the prophet with ten other books, called sacerdotal, relating to the laws, the gods, and the rules of the priesthood. Thus, then, of the forty-two most useful books of Hermes, thirty-six contained all the philosophy of Egypt, and the six last treated of medicine, anatomy, and cure of diseases.”—*Clem. Strom.*, l. 6, s. 4. Lipsiæ, 1832.

The Nile is the next power we shall consider. His hieroglyphic name is Hapi Môou. He is represented as of a blue colour; and it is remarkable that *Nil* or *Neel* means *blue* in most eastern

languages: *Nilghaut*, blue mountains; *Nilab*, blue river. Has *Neleus* a similar derivation? We pass various divinities in this vast pantheon. The year, and even the hours, as in Greece, receive adoration. These latter are frequently found graven on tombs and sarcophagi; and the form of the deceased is represented offering to them oblations or prayers, from the first to the twelfth day and night.

We next come to one of the most singular points of Egyptian worship, that of the four Genii, or gods, of Amenti. Every person who has been present at either of the sales of Burton or Athanasi, at Messrs. Sotheby, must have remarked the extreme beauty of the vases marked with these Genii. Sorrow, indeed, we did, and deeply, to see many of them pass from us. In elegance of shape and originality of figure, these vases were unique. The four Genii over these urns perform a conspicuous part in the ceremonies of the dead: they are present before Osiris in judgment, and they, like guardian angels—an idea as old as Hesiod *—protect, by their influence, the passing souls. On the embalming of the body the intestines were taken out and deposited in vases, with the heads of these Genii on them, or replaced in the body with these four figures: they are given in plate 61. The first, Amset, had the head of a man; the second, Hapi, the head of a cynocephalus ape; the third, Smof, of a jackal: and the fourth, Netsonof, of a hawk. Of these singular combinations of animals with men even the Christian Church made mystical use at her earliest and purest hour; and it is a circumstance that cannot but move deep questioning, for the forms of the Cherubim appear analogous. To these deities were dedicated the intestines. To the first, the stomach and large intestines; to the second, the small intestines; to the third, the lungs; and to the fourth—for which discovery we are indebted to modern research—the liver and gall-bladder. How far does the chivalric vow performed by the Douglas for the heart of Bruce, and of Cœur de Lion in giving his to a peculiar locality, differ from the Egyptians? It would be curious to trace out the distinction. When any person of rank was embalmed, the intestines were deposited in four alabaster vases, or other costly materials. Some used cheaper materials, such as painted wood, pottery, &c.; but the cover of each was surmounted by the head of the deity to whom the intestinal portions were devoted. Our own judicial astrology was little in advance of this, as they will do well to remember who curl up the lip of scorn at the Egyptian. With the poorer classes the intestines were

* Hesiod, *Opera et Dies*, b. i., l. 120.

returned, by the usual incision on the left side through which they had been drawn; the figures of the four Genii, of wax or aromatic composition, enveloped in cloth, were introduced into the cavity. The aperture was then closed, and covered with a leaden plate, on which was carved the eye (of Osiris?) or the same four Genii, who were thought to preside within. And *Amenti* signified, with the Egyptian, the region of departed souls. The analogy of *Amenti Ement*, the west, is well worthy of observation; as is also that of Erebus, and the Hebrew ערב sunset. It is remarkable that no trace is observable of any peculiar position of Egyptian temples, as regards the cardinal points. No two face in the same direction, save possibly by accident. The *assessors* of the dead in *Amenti* are forty-two. Sir G. Wilkinson found them complete in the side adytum of a temple at Thebes. In common with the Genii of the *Amenti*, they have the peculiarity of a human form with different heads—hawk, hare, hippopotamus, &c., and for which we refer our readers to plate 62. The infernal regions are not without the dog of hell, or his equivalent, in a monster with the form of the hippopotamus seated at the entrance of *Amenti*. A variety of deities of an uncertain character follow; and while upon this subject we must remind Sir G. Wilkinson, that the figure given as *death* (plate 41), with the dress of the Roman soldier, is just as likely to be what it is outwardly, as what he represents it. It is not worthy of being figured at all in such a collection, being unquestionably modern.

We next pass to the sacred animals. The ape, or cynocephalus, which we have already stated was the symbol of Thoth, was in high esteem, we know; but what advantage did the Egyptians derive from the cynocephalus to realize the theory of Cicero: “*Aegyptii nullam Belluam, nisi ob aliquam utilitatem quam ex ea caperent consecrarunt.*” No one can believe the ridiculous reason of Hermes Trismegistus, that during the time of the two equinoxes it was observed to stale twelve times a day, and constantly at an equal distance of time, or that the Clepsydra was constructed from this circumstance. No adequate motive can be assigned for the mummifying of apes. Passing numerous animals we come to the dog, worshipped at Cynopolis, and probably his elevation to this rank was owing to the heliacal rising of Sirius on the dog days. In similar manner the wolf, also worshipped and mummified at Lycopolis, probably derives his rank.

We next proceed to the ichneumon, which does not appear at present to justify its high character in ancient time, but with his habitat to have also changed his habits: still the ancient paintings, which describe this animal as constantly on the quest

for the crocodile's eggs, would appear to confirm the story of Herodotus. The history of its attacks on serpents and crocodiles is too numerously affirmed to be absolutely denied, and it is at present frequently seen to attack the former with considerable intrepidity, killing them by a single bite. The tale of its hermaphrodite nature is, of course, false. It is a somewhat remarkable peculiarity that the hyena is never deified: it occurs on the ancient sculptures in numerous places. The Abyssinians have an extraordinary fancy with respect to this animal: they affirm that a race of blacksmiths in their country have the power of changing their form at pleasure, and assuming that of the hyena. Sir G. Wilkinson, when expressing his disbelief of this extraordinary story, was told by an Englishman, who had lived thirty years in the country, that no Abyssinian doubted the fact, and that no one at all acquainted with the country would think of denying it. "I had a proof of it myself (says the gentleman in question); for, while I was walking and conversing with one of these blacksmiths, I happened to turn my head aside for a few instants, and on looking round again I found that he had changed himself, and was trotting away at a little distance from me under his new form." The travelled gentleman was witty on Sir G. Wilkinson. One thing is certainly remarkable with respect to the hyena, that at the height of 14,000 French feet from the sea this animal maintains equally his savage propensities, seizing on the mules of such imprudent travellers as neglect the ordinary precautions against them, from supposing the severity of the mountainous region to form a protection.

In no snug nook of England, however frequented by aged spinsters, does the respect for the cat at all amount to that entertained for this animal by the Egyptians. The numerous mummies of these animals, and the curious swathing that surrounds them, are familiar to the collector. The animal's colour and hue within the bandages are indicated by its painted head. There is considerable probability that this animal was of great service in the extinction of snakes and scorpions, since we have seen it in the East attack them very vigorously. The lion received his worship pre-eminently in Leontopolis. This animal is represented as the constant attendant upon warriors in battle. The lion-headed deity is chiefly worshipped in southern Ethiopia. The lion was introduced from Egypt to Greece, and those over the gate of Mycenæ are similar to the Egyptian. The mummies of lions are nowhere discoverable. The worship of the lion is only the reverence of a quality, and seems distinct from the utilitarian principle by which the Egyptian is supposed to have been governed. Neither is the lion indigenous to Egypt,

it must be remembered. Similar remarks will apply with respect to the elephant, but in the hippopotamus the reverse principle again obtains. This animal, the Cerberus of the Egyptian hell, the emblem of Typho, was indigenous to the land. It was worshipped at Papremis, but appears to have been execrated in other parts of Egypt. A few images of the blue pottery alone contain this animal's head, with human limbs. Even this enormous creature is found mummified by the Egyptians, of which the British Museum contains a specimen. In equal abhorrence was the hog among the Egyptians, they considering its body the abode of the souls of evil men. Can such analogies, as obviously do exist in this nation and others, with the possession of the swine by the demons, be without some lost chain of connection? And can the impurity of this animal, whom Jew and Mahometan alike avoid, be without similar reasons? Of course it is almost needless to add that this animal is never found in mummy. The horse is equally unnoticed among the sacred animals; but the ass enjoys the distinction of being dedicated to the evil spirit Typho. Its colour was thought to partake of the evil being, and all red-haired persons were supposed to be equally connected with him. No mummies of this animal appear. It is certainly also an unaccountable circumstance that the camel is not seen in the hieroglyphics. The giraffe is frequently figured, but never found embalmed. The oryx, though occurring on the mysterious boat of Pthah-Sokari-Osiris, was not a sacred animal. The goat retained high honours in the Mendesian nome, and the whole of this division went into mourning when a he-goat died. The sheep preserved a sacred character also, as we have seen in the head of the ram-headed deity—not Amun, but Neph. This animal also figures on the zodiac of Egypt. The ox and cow were both sacred. Apis, Mnevis, and Basis, are all sacred bulls; and the cow of Athor receives similar worship as among the Hindoos. Bull and cow mummies are constantly found. Amid combinations of animals, the sphinx is certainly the most extraordinary. There are three kinds—the Andro-sphinx, with the head of a man and the body of a lion; the Krio-sphinx, with the head of a ram and the body of a lion; and the Hawk-sphinx, with the same body and a hawk's head. The inconsistency and ignorance of even Æschylus and the elder Greek writers, in making the sphinx female, is apparent, from the fact that the Egyptians looked upon the sphinx as an emblem of the king. The kingly emblems are the ram, the hawk, and the sphinx. Maurice and the early Egyptian writers lead the reader into sad delusions on this point, and numerous others, from trusting to Greek sources

of information. The sculptures constantly represent a deity presenting to the sphinx the sign of life, or other gifts usually given by the gods to a king, as well as to the ram or hawk, when in the same capacity emblematic of a Pharaoh. Many other compounds of unnatural character, similar to the sphinx, occur on the sculptures, but on these we have not room to dilate.

Passing sacred birds—the vulture of Neith, the hawk Ibis, &c.—we proceed to the crocodile, sacred to Savak. Two cities were named from it, and its worship pervaded a large portion of Egypt. M. Pauw remarks that, on an exact examination of the topography of Egypt, he observed Coptos, Arsinoe, and Crocodinopolis (Athribis), the towns most remarkable for the adoration of this animal, were all situated on canals at some distance from the Nile. The least negligence in allowing the ditches to be filled up prevented the arrival of these animals at the very places where they were considered the emblems of pure water. While this worship then was in fashion, the government felt assured that the canals would be efficiently repaired. Human policy entered into the worship; but if worshipped in some spots, it was execrated in others, and considered as the emblem of the evil spirit. An immense quantity of stuff is uttered by Ælian and other Greek writers on the subject of this animal, with as much reason as the assertion that it has no tongue, or that the elephant has no knees—a rather unlucky application made by a clergyman to his congregation in the time of Addison. This gigantic animal is found at Thebes, of full size, in mummy, and perfectly preserved. The asp we have already noticed in another part. This royal emblem also occurs in mummy: it is about six feet in length, which, as Sir G. Wilkinson remarks, is a most inconvenient size for Cleopatra to have used; but he inclines to the opinion that it was not the *asp*, but a smaller poisonous serpent, which she applied, of a more convenient and portable size, in Lower Egypt, and thus mis-called by the Greeks. The emblem of the serpent with his tail in his mouth, commonly considered as implying eternity, has no such Egyptian signification, though it occurs on papyri encircling the figure of Harpocrates.

Passing the sacred fish, we proceed to the insects. Amid these the scarabæus occupies a leading position. It was an emblem of the sun, and also of the world; it is the distinguishing sign of Phthah or Vulcan. The most exquisite carving in the power of Egypt to minister is employed on the numerous scarabæi, in their varied materials. We cannot but think they were used as signets. A winged scarabæus was generally placed over those bodies which were embalmed by the most expensive

process. Of the sacred trees and plants we can afford no further mention than the simple statement, that the sarcasm of Juvenal, that the gardens of the Egyptians supplied them with divinities, is not established by the monuments. Garlic and onions do not appear to have commanded any peculiar respect or regard. With respect to the sacred emblems, Sir G. Wilkinson is extremely brief, reserving them evidently for some future occasion. The *crux ansata*, or *sign of life*, is remarkable from the use made of it by the early Christians, who took this pagan emblem and applied it for the cross: in how high a sense a sign of life to them! The tau still preserves its place on the sepulchres of the Christians on the great oasis. May not the force of even the ordinary reading of Isaiah xxxvi. 6, and of the parallel passage, 2 Kings xviii. 21, be enhanced by the consideration that the *reed* is the emblem of royalty? "Lo, thou trustest on the staff of this broken *reed*, on Egypt; whereon if a man lean it will go into his hand and pierce it: such is Pharaoh, king of Egypt, to all that trust on him." The reed was also the emblem of Upper Egypt,* and the initial of the word *souten*, "king." Passing the interesting review of the numerous sacrifices and festivals, we are happy to find Sir G. Wilkinson confirming our own notion, that human sacrifices did not disgrace Egypt as they did India. Dr. Prichard, with his immense learning, does not prove his point in this respect; nor are any monumental effigies of kings slaying their thousands in battle to be relied on as establishing this fact. The Egyptian was evidently in advance of the Greek, the Druid, and the Brahmin, in this respect.

We shall now proceed to the last chapter, one of the most interesting, from its relation to funereal obsequies. Amid the first, *offerings to the dead* are certainly singular, as exhibiting a conformity to that curious custom still maintained in Lithuania, called *Dziady*, or *feast of the dead*, which the Polish poet, Mickiewicz, has married to immortal verse—a custom common to all the Scandinavian tribes, known to Homer, and even extant in the islands of the new world. In Egypt, however, their offerings are not to the deceased, but to that portion of the divine essence supposed to constitute each soul in life, and to return into the bosom of Deity after death. Each soul became Osirian; each body was bound up, so as to resemble that mysterious ruler of Amenti. Like the masses of the Romish Church, the liturgical ceremonies over the dead lasted as long as

* *תנין בבוץ* Psalm lxxviii. 31. The wild beast of the reeds, i. e., the crocodile, as a symbol of Egypt.—Gesenius.

the family paid for their observance. "When the mummies remained in the house (says our author), or in the chamber of the sepulchre, they were kept in moveable wooden closets with folding doors, out of which they were taken to a small altar, where the priest officiated. The closet and the mummy were placed on a sledge, in order to facilitate their movement from one place to another; and the latter was drawn with ropes to the altar, and taken back by the same means when the ceremony was over. On these occasions they made the usual offering of incense and libation, with cakes, flowers, and fruit, and even anointed the mummy, oil or ointment being poured over its head." (Vol. ii., p. 384). The analogy of these rites with the *inferiæ* or *parentalia* of the Romans must be visible to all; the mummy not unfrequently, according to Lucian, was a guest at the festive board; and as it was frequently kept disintombed, even for a year, these ceremonies may be considered initiatory to burial. The νεκροδειπνον must have had something solemn in character, though we should fear it was often attended by the reckless folly that not even decaying mortality can subdue. Small tables were placed on the tombs, also bearing offerings of ducks, cakes, and other viands; and their trussing, of which the Egyptian room in the British Museum furnishes examples, does not vary from the modern style in that country. Moses forbade this vain folly. Their tombs consisted generally of one or more chambers, ornamented with paintings and sculptures. They were formed by the priests, who appear to have made a regular mart of them. If the Egyptian's house was homely, his tomb, at least, was honourable. Suitable objects to the deceased's calling were invariably selected: the tomb was prepared for the husband and wife; children also were buried in the same. Husband and wife were represented as enwreathed in each other's arms, which gives a lively image of conjugal affection. When any one died the loudest exclamations of sorrow were heard, and the females of the mansion ran through the streets exhibiting deep signs of dejection; the body was carried to the bier head foremost; the loud cries at funereal obsequies were prohibited by Mahomet. The pomp of a royal funeral almost exceeds description; plate 83, of a royal scribe, will give a good illustration of it. When the hearse, which was carried in the Baris, had arrived at the sacred lake, it was towed across by another large boat, that generally contained the mourners. When at the tomb, the funeral ritual was read from the papyrus. It indicated generally, to Osiris and the assessors, the character of the dead person. Every large city had a Stygian lake, where

these rites of the dead were practised ; and from these Egyptian sources Charon and the Styx are clearly derivable. The Egyptians placed gold and silver coins in the mouth of the dead, as the Greeks did—not to pay, however, the “grim ferryman,” but to indicate the virtuous character of the deceased. Osiris is the Minos of the dead. Mercury Psychopompus is Anubis. Justice without a head, and scales of truth, occur at the gate of Amenti ; and the Cerberus even, we have shown, had a worthy prototype. Singularly rigid seem their rites of the dead ; monarchs escaped not then from their free censure, if wicked or unjust ; even funeral rites were withheld them, if undeserved. Still was the Egyptian clear of that posthumous hatred that, even in England, led to the disentombment of the regicides of Charles I. ; or to those inflictions on a deceased foe that stain even the hero of the *Ilias*. Among no nation does there appear to have prevailed a livelier sense of a great kingdom of accountability, of which Thoth appears to fill the office of recording angel. The sculptured walls of every tomb reminded them of this, and of the witness they might bear against them. The words of Ulysses in the *Hecuba* certainly appear to contemplate the sumptuous tomb of the Egyptian, combined with Greek cruelty in immolating life on it, and also this large posthumous reputation.

“Τύμβον δὲ βελοίμην ἄν ἀξιούμενον
Τὸν ἐμὸν ὀρᾶσθαι ἑὰ μακρὰ γὰρ ἡ χάρις.”

We shall now consider the transmigration and immortality of the soul. According to Herodotus, ii. 123, the Egyptians were the first to maintain the immortality of the soul, and that after death it enters into some other animal, which is born ; and when it has passed through all those of the earth, water, and air, it enters again that of a man, which circuit is accomplished in 3,000 years. Plato, Pythagoras, and Pherecydes, all mention this theory. Plato's limit of time varies from that of Herodotus by 7,000 years. His passage in the *Phædrus* is well worthy of serious attention. To this general notion we quite agree that Virgil yielded, in the celebrated passage where he represents the world as subject to precisely the same revolving events : and it is obvious that Ovid has corrupted purer elements of the system, and given, not an Egyptian metamorphosis, or metempsychosis, but a Greek. This notion of a recurrence of causes would lead us into too extended an argument to permit us to treat it at present. Life must be, to a certain extent, monotonous while man is evil ; and this is all that leads to the analogy. Many think that the Egyptian preserved the mummy for its thousands of

years under this notion. He was, at least, right in his method of preservation: he has made the mummy the key to unlock past time; but that this resuscitation, at the best, approaches resurrection, or to affirm that such was his intention, would be to affirm only, without a capability of proof. This hypothesis is likely to be tested by many generations, since the mummies are in hands who will probably preserve and transmit them for many thousands of years. It is certainly remarkable that the opinion should be equally maintained by the Brahminist, the Buddhist, and the Druid, though the latter, as appears from Cæsar, B. G. 6, 14, limited this migration to men. The method of embalming, as described by Herodotus, ii. 86, and Diodorus, i. 91, is so well known that we shall not extract the account. Of the three methods, the first, and most expensive, cost a talent of silver, or 250*l.*; the second, twenty-two minæ, or 60*l.*; and the third was extremely cheap. The question of the extraction of the brain through the nostrils is clearly established by the tombs. Diodorus is, however, in error in his assertion, that the actual face of the dead Egyptian remained visible to sight. The features, as well as body, were enveloped in bandages; but, whatever number of cases a mummy possessed, the face of each was intended for a representation of the person within. Egyptian pathology was doubtless improved by the mummy process. The abstraction of the intestines must have led to the study of their pathology and form. Egyptian medical art had reached a minute state of classification; oculists, dentists, and intestinal practitioners all attest the same; and the skill in embalming of the Egyptian is a thing perfectly well known and highly appreciated by the modern members of the medical profession. Sir G. Wilkinson furnishes a singular instance, in the mummy opened by Dr. Granville, of their supremacy in the art, which is evidenced by the fact, that, when they had removed the internal tegument of the skull, they still contrived to preserve the thin membrane below, though the heat of the embalming matter, afterwards poured into the cavity, had perforated this section and scorched the scalp (vol. ii. 474). The account of Herodotus fails to inform us what became of the intestines, but the tombs clear up this point satisfactorily. They were never removed from a close connection with the individual mummy to which they belonged. Porphyry and Plutarch are quite wrong in their statement that the intestines were thrown away. Porphyry's form of funeral invocation is also incorrect. Our readers will find the form at full in the "*Foreign Quarterly Review*," No. 49. The intestines, when removed, were placed in the tomb with the coffin, and were, as has been noted, under the guardian care of

the four Genii of Amenti. In the most expensive method of embalmment they were placed in vases, with the heads of these Genii on each. In other instances they were, after proper cleansing, restored to the body through the lateral incision by which they were originally removed, and the images of these Genii placed with them. Let any one, we again repeat, remember, who smiles at the Egyptian, that many years have not passed since astrology assigned each of our members to the guardianship of some deity or influence, and not be too rigid on the follies of 3,000 years ago. If mummies can be all classed under the three divisions under which Herodotus and Diodorus arrange them, they may also be arranged under two general heads: first, those with the ventral incision; secondly, those without any incision. Of the first there are two kinds: first, those preserved by balsamic matter; secondly, those preserved by natron. These first-class mummies may further be again distinguished by the following peculiarities: first, mummies of which the intestines were deposited in vases; secondly, those of which the intestines were returned to the body. The first is the most expensive process; and the body, when prepared with the proper drugs and spices, was enveloped in linen bandages sometimes measuring one thousand yards in length; it was then enclosed in a cartonage, fitting closely to the mummied body, which was richly painted, often covered in front with a net-work of beads and bugles, arranged in a tasteful form, and the face was laid over with gold leaf, and the eyes made of enamel. The three or four cases which covered the cartonage were similarly ornamented, and the whole was enclosed in a sarcophagus of wood or stone, decorated profusely with painting or sculpture. These were generally priests, some most sumptuous specimens of which, as yet unrolled, are in the Egyptian room in the British Museum. The skin itself is sometimes covered with gold leaf; sometimes portions of the body only. Occasionally the outer cases are not highly ornamented, this being reserved for the cartonage; on others, this cost has been evidently expended on the outer cases, or the sarcophagi. Those mummies where the intestines are returned to the body are found in cases less richly ornamented; and some of these are of the second class of mummies, viz., those with the ventral incision, which were also of two kinds: first, those salted and filled with bituminous matter less pure than the others; secondly, simply salted. The first are not recognizable—even the very ornaments on them are so burnt in with the pitch that they are ruined. One of these was recently opened at Exeter Hall, and hugely disappointed expectation, since it was supposed to have been full of gems, from

its immense weight. Secondly, the mummies simply salted and dried are generally worse preserved than those with resins and bitumen. Greek mummies may be distinguished from Egyptian by the disposition of the bandages of the arms and legs. The arms in the first are placed at the sides, and bound separately; but in the second, they are enclosed in one common envelope, without any separation in the bandages. No Egyptian is found with the legs bandaged separately, like the Greek mummies. On the breast of the mummy was placed the scarabæus, in contact with the flesh. The materials of which the scarabæi are composed are silver and lead in the wings, or else of stone or the blue pottery. On the cartonage, exactly correspondent to the interior, is placed another scarabæus, frequently with Isis and Nepthys in an attitude of prayer. On the outer cases the same place was occupied by a scarabæus, or other emblems. The mummy cases often exhibit a great variety of subjects.

In the first-class mummies the innermost covering, after the bandages, was the cartonage, or pasteboard case. This corresponded exactly to the body, and was pressed on it when in a damp state; it was then removed and kept in the shape thus received until dry, when it was again applied to the bandaged body, and sewn up at the back. The artists then commenced their embellishments. The face was made to resemble the deceased, as far as the Egyptian portrait painter's skill could reach, which, unless ancient physiognomy preserved a sameness unknown to modern nations (a matter by no means incredible), does not appear to be of highly varied excellency. The eyes were inlaid, and the hair of females arranged in their natural plaits. The Genii of Amenti, Netpe with expanded wings, sacred arks, &c., figure on the cartonage. A long line of hieroglyphics down the front of the mummy express the name and quality, and the offerings presented to the gods. Netpe always appears, with extended wings, on some part of the coffin. Of the three cases the innermost is the most highly ornamented. We refer our readers to the splendid specimens now exposed in the new Egyptian rooms of the British Museum. Rich necklaces were placed or figured on the neck of each, and net-work of beads, in elegant shapes, covers the breast. The workmanship of the Egyptian in several gold necklaces, especially those that imitate the small cowry, equals any modern artist. The outer case was either of wood or stone—Isis was at one end, Nepthys at the other. Of sarcophagi, the most splendid instance possibly may be seen in the museum of Sir J. Soane, in Lincoln's-Inn-fields, open during its season, on due notice, to any person. This splendid specimen is of alabaster; but basalt,

granite, slate, or limestone, were often used. In the tomb various objects were placed, such as the fancy or kindness of friends suggested. Vases, papyri, jewels, and other ornaments, were deposited in the tomb; and probably legends of the deceased are contained on the tablets of stone or wood placed near the sarcophagus. Sir G. Wilkinson, we believe, wears a ring, of very high workmanship, taken from the hand of a mummy; and Mr. Sotheby, who has knocked down more mummies than any of his countrymen, is similarly decorated on his digits by a token of his connection with the dead. Had the Egyptian been a votary of that modern sect, that in its wisdom looks on all things earthly as adumbrating the heavenly, and that each man's calling here will be perpetuated hereafter, he could not have given more effectual countenance to the notion than in his tomb emblems. Priests have the insignia of their office. The scribe has his inkstand or palette, the high priest the censer, the baker his bread, all in readiness to serve their calling.

And here we close our extracts from the subject matter of Sir G. Wilkinson's work. To do him justice, though without extensive learning, he writes agreeably and practically. His hieroglyphical information is not profound, but possibly one with more profundity might have produced a work of infinitely less popular character. We believe it may be added, that every copy of the work is already sold, which demonstrates an interest in archaiological researches on the part of the British public that augurs nobly. It would be unfair were the writer not also to state, that, wherever Egyptian antiquities have been offered for sale in this country, Sir G. Wilkinson has invariably used all possible exertions to secure them to us—to such an extent as to propose in the very sale-room a subscription to purchase them for the British Museum. His works owe much of their large and extended circulation to his own personal character; but it ought also to be added that few write more clearly down their meaning, or exhibit more truthfulness of purpose. It will now be our endeavour to give a slight sketch of our own notions of the Egyptian in civilization and religion.

It is a circumstance of undoubted singularity that no literary production from the Egyptians has reached us. We should be led to wrong deductions were we to infer much to their discredit from this circumstance, for the same point might be equally urged against the Chaldeans. The far safer inference will be to judge them by their deeds. They have left their mark on the world, and the pyramids alone, passed over by Homer in singular silence, are adequate to perpetuate their memory till time shall be no more. It is certainly singular, but it is un-

questionably true, that the Greeks have made no acknowledgments that lead us to think them indebted to the Egyptians; but the weak vanity of that nation, their constant attempts to show themselves of high antiquity, their autochthonic feints, are clumsily executed and indifferently concealed. Architecture they clearly learnt from the Egyptians, and they certainly paid back the obligation by an improvement, as statuaries, of the rigid Egyptian style. The Memnon in the Museum, and many other statues of higher than ordinary character, we conceive to be their work. The Egyptian also, in all human probability, was greatly curtailed in expression by the ideographic character of his style. As yet all that we have deciphered contains such a monotony of expression that we cannot but suspect that the language has yet to be read to a far greater extent than anticipated. Directions to read up or down, forwards or backwards, are somewhat startling. If the Egyptian has been almost buried in his own sands until recently, his disentombers seem prepared to give him credit for astonishing discoveries, such as steam (ascribed to him by Arago), railroads, and most modern inventions. We are inclined strongly to the supposition that modern discoveries have been often discovered, to use a figure of our sister isle. In our own times the art of printing can scarce be claimed as an European invention, when China has possessed it for centuries that shame our intelligence. Even the mariner's compass and the steam-boat are to be found, possibly, in the arrow of Abaris and the Phœnician vessels of Homer. The art also of tempering copper, to a hardness equal to steel, appears to have been an Egyptian discovery. Certainly, on looking around the Egyptian room, or passing into the Etruscan beyond it, it is a matter of wondrous difficulty to make up our minds on the exact mental character of these nations, who have left no written trace at present visible of their ideas on physics or general science. But the exactitude of the astronomical and geometrical art in Egypt certainly appears clearly established. If their acquirements in natural history were not exclusive, they at least drew the objects exquisitely. The Egyptian, as a limner, was mighty in colours, though harsh in outline, like all young artists, for it was then the world's childhood; as a sculptor, hard—out of drawing, but not out of character. His smaller subjects on the sarcophagi are extremely beautiful and well drawn, in many instances. His astronomy, probably Chaldean, was, at any rate, or however derived, vastly superior to the Greeks; and the long visits of philosophers of that country to Egypt, which boasted the attendance of nearly all of high notoriety, were not without advantage to the travelled tourist.

History was certainly deeply studied; and heraldry appears to be the genius of their language, since emblems and shadowy forms, and not clear description, seem to have suited the public mind. On the whole, however, the Egyptian must be considered, taking him all in all, as the Thranites in the bark of civilization. What was his religion? A difficult question. Were we to listen to Carlyle (a writer who finds even in Grand Lamaism a kind of truth) we should be led to the opposite conclusion of the Scriptures, and be inclined to think the Egyptian follies venial. This writer unsettles all notions, without giving any to supply their room, or having any of his own. He would, on some ground or other, vindicate the worship of every beast, bird, and flower of the gushing life of creation, as he does that of Canopus. But neither he nor Schlegel, who seeks to find out, in the physical benefits conferred by the sacred animals, the mystery of their worship, are looked upon as oracles of divine truth. They may Pythonize, but the world now is in possession of the secret of the inspiration of disordered faculties, and not likely to choose either Carlyle or a German metaphysician for its moral or religious guide. Taking him in comparison with the Brahminist and the Buddhist, we cannot but consider the Egyptian low as an etherealist. Elements worshipped, the body perpetuated in its organization, the labour on the tomb, and the toil to heap it up for everlasting centuries, look like one who sought in posthumous honour on earth his all. If, too, the tale be true of the object of their three thousand years' preservation of the mummy, it was certainly not resurrection, but almost resuscitation that was aimed at. This adhesiveness of principle to dust and ashes—this hideous perpetuation of death, does not look like a high and ennobling view of futurity. The soul, too, though held to be immortal, is as degraded in the current of immortality as we can conceive it; and Druidism is an advance on the system of the metempsychosis, for here the souls pass through human bodies only. In ritual, we fear the Egyptian lost the spirit of the *ritual*. If the letter killeth, Egyptian mysticism must have done it tenfold. The deep curse on Ham seems to have settled on the line of the Pharaohs, who were not simply the slaves of men, but the degraded vassals to the lowest of the brute creation. The monarch bowing to the "shard-born beetle," shows that mighty delusion to have possessed the line that led them "to believe a lie." What influence had Egypt on Israel? The influence of superior civilization, which led the Jews to imitate her in her dark idolatry.

On one subject there is certainly a marked difference between the Egyptian and all other nations—that he seems more cursed

than all with the fatal vice of giving the supreme God's glory to another; and in his pantheon we do not recognize a deity distinct from the rest, and sublimely elevated beyond them. He is the least of a Monotheist of any etherealist upon earth. The Jove even of the Greek is higher in this respect than any of his deities. His conquests do not appear to have extended his religion, for its character was too complex to be easily apprehended. Whether the Jew and South American figure upon the remains, we think doubtful; but many excellent judges think they do. If so, as deeper advance is daily making in the dark hand, we shall obtain this strange information ere long. How interesting would it be if some one equal to it would undertake to gather into one mighty work the dim rays of common tradition and common rites from all parts of the earth! Modern discoveries have so expanded the tongues of earth, and shown such mutual connection, that philology would now aid researches where her introduction was considered impossible. Who shall grasp the contents of such a book? It will, we trust, by such means, be developed that the early intercourse among nations has been larger than is commonly supposed; and if remote China ministered to the Egyptian, as is apparent from their manufactures in the tombs, then who shall trace the past connection of nations? who shall put the limit to the Phœnician bark? and who shall affirm that the Phœnician ships of Homer were not impelled by steam? The lesson read from the tomb of the worshipper of Pthah is, not to seek in high manufactures, skill, and eminent art, a nation's true prosperity; but to found it on the intelligibility of a moral and religious system, on its appreciability by the general mind, on the diffusion of sound religion, by no mystical, but truth-teaching pastors. The political eminence of England is the world's wonder; and even the Druses turn to her for light, and believe in her God-sustained influence. The oracle of Ammon is buried in the sands of the Libyan desert; but the oracle of Catholic England stands revealed to all, appreciable by all, understood by all. Others mystified truth; let England teach it in its pure element, and a renown beyond the pyramids, a glory among nations, will arise to the queen of the seas, such as never yet has dawned, but which shall appear in characters of light beyond all that the Thaumaturgists of the Nile could work, and which shall connect her with the strain of unborn ages as their ennobling and eternizing principle.

ART. V.—Circular to the Clergy of the Establishment. By RICHARD BURDON SANDERSON, Esq., formerly Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, and sometime Secretary of Presentations to the late Lord Chancellor Eldon.

2. *The Autobiography of an Obsolete Churchman ; in a Letter to the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.* By R. B. SANDERSON, Esq., &c. &c.

3. *The Church of England and the Church of Christ : a Lecture delivered in the Town Hall, Hertford.* By the Rev. JOHN BURNET.

WE remember, in the days of our childhood, a story of a certain Emperor of China, whose name at full length would occupy half a page of our Review, unless we mutilated his titles and dignities, who thought fit to declare war against the whole world. Having made proclamation to this effect, and thereby produced a great sensation among the subjects of the celestial empire, he proceeded with an army, composed of such people as you may see depicted upon (real Nankin) cups and saucers, to show that he was in earnest, and issued forth of his dominions. After the lapse of several months this puissant sovereign returned to his capital, with the proud boast that he had overcome and reduced into subjection every opponent that he had met—that he returned victorious over all nations who had been rash enough to deny his sovereignty over the whole universe. His own forces had sustained no loss whatever in so serious a conflict. Whereupon, as seemed most fitting, a solemn oration took place, and a grand illumination with paper lanthorns in his porcelaine metropolis.

Something resembling this conduct of the Emperor of China is that of Richard Burdon Sanderson, Esq. He has addressed a circular letter to the clergy of the Church of England, appended to which is a tabular statement of that gentleman's interpretation of a certain portion of the Apocalypse. He has the singular modesty to commence his "Circular" with the following oration :—

"As the facts of history, on which the following tables are founded, are, I presume, undisputed ; and as no one (no Churchman at least, and on such a subject I do not feel myself called upon to answer the cavils of Dissenters) has yet come forward to dispute their application, although it is now upwards of three years since that application was first made public—I am entitled, I conceive, to take it for granted, that such application is as indisputable as the facts themselves on which it is founded."

This is delectable reasoning ! The Emperor of China sinks into insignificance before the magniloquence of Mr. Sanderson's eulogy of himself. He might securely say that every opponent had been overcome, because he met none—that he had vanquished all who denied his claims, since no one had heard of or cared for them. But Mr. Sanderson goes a step further. He had published to the whole world and the entire universe his peculiar interpretation of the part of Scripture referred to; and therefore his views, his claims, and his designs must, unlike those of his celestial majesty, have been known, and have drawn the marked attention of all mankind. Therefore, never having been challenged, not even been attempted by the breath of controversy, must they necessarily be beyond the reach of possible confutation. What an enviable situation for an author ! How sweet his repose after labour under laurels so laudably won, and so gracefully worn !

Alas ! such glories sometimes have their alloy. Did it never occur to Mr. Sanderson that a book which nobody reads, and of which nobody ever heard, sometimes is noticed by nobody, and answered by nobody ? A pamphlet may be very mischievous in its purpose, extremely silly in its detail, and woefully ill-written ; but if it should peradventure be so stupid and dull that no one can read it, there will be small inducement for any one to expose to the public either its mischievous tendency, its extreme folly, on its bad English.

Our readers will, we trust, give us credit for having no such purpose in putting Mr. Sanderson's lucubrations at the head of this article, and coupling his name with that of another worthy, who has come forward to maintain the cause of the (so-called) "voluntary system," which is now, like the shares in the Australian Company, at a discount. We have taken the lucubrations of these eminent gentlemen as the ostensible subject of the present article, because we wish to offer some observations to our readers on that which is the favourite topic of both, "the voluntary principle."

But first we cannot resist the temptation of treating our friends with some insight into Mr. Sanderson's interpretation of prophecy.

It is really melancholy to witness the temerity and thoughtless audacity with which men are wont to vent their idle and vain conjectures on that most awful book, the Apocalypse. Looking at its contents with microscopic eyes, they magnify something in history which they think they spy there, until its magnitude renders them incapable of seeing anything else, as is invariably the case with that numerous class of persons who

are appropriately styled "men of *one idea*." Accordingly you may listen to the teaching of one of this class who can very distinctly point out to you, in the page of St. John, the battle of Austerlitz, or the congress of Vienna; but, gaze as long as he will, he can find nothing to denote the empire of Charlemagne or of Tamerlane. Another will insist upon it that such a passage points to the revocation of the edict of Nantz; but he totally forgets to discover any allusion to the rise of the Mahometan religion or the Ottoman power!

We cannot rise from reading such speculations without an impression that the author of such views must have supposed that the Revelation of St. John had respect, almost exclusively, to the affairs and welfare of Great Britain, at the period during which it pleased Providence that they themselves should be numbered among its population.

Mr. Sanderson, however, to give him his due, excels these gentlemen almost as much as he does the Emperor of China, with whom we have unworthily compared him. Take the following as specimens:—

"And I beheld (says the sacred text, Rev. xiii. 11) another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon."

According to Mr. Sanderson, this *second* beast is the supremacy of the Church, the fee-simple of which Henry VIII. took from the Pope, who was *beast the first*. The two horns "like a lamb," were the two English Universities, which he tells us were aiding or abetting the English monarch in that assumption of supremacy. We wonder he did not tell us that a certain Dr. Lamb is actually master of one of our colleges at Cambridge, which would have given additional force to his interpretation. And the dragon's voice, he assures us, refers to Henry's proclamations, which had all the force of Papal decrees.

The image to the first beast (Rev. xiii. 14) personates, as Mr. Sanderson will have it, the Book of Common Prayer; and he is so good as to inform us that the Sacramentary of St. Gregory the Great is commonly called the "Canon of the Mass." This is a most superb flight of presumptuous ignorance! It is clear that Mr. Sanderson has never had the slightest knowledge either of Gregory's Sacramentary or the Canon Missæ, otherwise he would not have thus identified them. To proceed: the fire coming down from heaven (v. 13) is interpreted to be "carnal eloquence inflamed by religious zeal;" rather a remarkable missive from the regions of bliss. The false prophet is the "court preachers." The mark in the right hand is declared to

be the sacramental elements, as administered in the Church of England, because the communicants receive the consecrated elements with the right hand in preference to the left, which, doubtless, is a relic of Popish superstition still adhering to our half-reformed Church. The mark in the forehead (v. 16) is unquestionably the cross in baptism.

This will be sufficient to give our readers some idea of Mr. Sanderson's principles of interpretation. We can go no further. Wearied with such profane impertinences ourselves, we should but disgust and offend those who peruse our pages: yet may a valuable lesson be learned from this sad example of perverted abilities, ill-regulated imagination, and insolent self-infallibility—a serious lesson, that should teach all Christians the necessity of spiritual caution and humility.

We know of only one thing more absurd and irrational than the ineffable nonsense above cited from Mr. Sanderson's "circular," and that would be an attempt to meet it by a grave and serious refutation. We have no intention of committing an act of such extreme folly; and, if he so please, he may consider this resolve as an additional proof that his application of the apocalyptic symbols is indisputably correct.

We must now turn to matter of a more palpable and intelligible nature than the moonlight-spun cobweb tissue of Mr. Sanderson's imagination, viz., the *soi-disant* "voluntary" system, whereof it will be readily apprehended that he is an advocate.

We perfectly understand the abstract reasoning of those who, upon principle, object to all establishments of religion, on the ground of our blessed Lord's own declaration, "My kingdom is not of this world;" but we wish these writers had been somewhat more careful not to confound things together which are neither identical in practice, nor synonymous in language. They urge that the royal supremacy does make Christ's kingdom, that is, the Church, a kingdom of this world; and, consequently, they conclude that any establishment of religion by the State is an infringement on the sovereignty of the glorified Redeemer, and high treason against his spiritual empire. There are many fallacies in this train of reasoning. When our Lord uttered the words in question, it was not for the purpose of instructing the Roman governor in any principles of ecclesiastical polity, which he intended either to disavow or to adopt, but to correct an erroneous impression, which Pilate had certainly adopted, that Christ, who he had been told made himself a king, claimed an earthly sovereignty as King of the Jews. "My kingdom (said he) is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be

delivered to the Jews : but now is my kingdom not from hence." We cannot legitimately infer more from these words than that our Lord's personal kingdom is purely spiritual—that he personally disclaimed a temporal monarchy. The result of the explanation was, that Pilate told the Jews, "I find in him no fault at all."

Another fatal mistake made by these reasoners relates to the spiritual nature of Christ's mediatorial kingdom, respecting which they discourse profusely, but of which they would not and could not speak as they are wont to do did they really feel and devoutly reverence his spiritual empire. Is his sovereignty so slight, and his power so easily subverted, and his diadem of glory so precariously worn, that it is in the power of earthly monarchs to despoil him of the heavenly crown, and thrust him from his throne? Could the converted Constantine usurp Christ's sceptre, and depose him from the right hand of the Father? Can such impious sacrilege, such successful warfare against the Son of God, be within the power of any mortal ruler, whether prince or Cæsar, Christian, or Pagan, or Pope, or be feasible by any council or synod of mortal men? No. They who tell us that the supremacy of Christian kings—whether they style themselves his Catholic Majesty, or his Christian Majesty, or Defender of the Faith—constitutes an usurpation of Christ's kingdom, have most weak and inadequate ideas of his spiritual sovereignty. They may conspire and take counsel together against the Lord; but HE "who dwelleth in heaven" derides their futile rivalry. These inconsiderate writers must surely be aware that something like government must exist in every organized Church; otherwise discord and anarchy must prevail. And whatever spiritual powers and franchises the Church of Christ may possess, by a divine charter, those powers, as well as the graces of the Spirit, are contained in earthen vessels, while we are conversant with mortality. If, then, the exercise of visible legal authority, in the visible Church of Christ, be inevitable, because it is manifestly essential to its existence, and if that authority is necessarily wielded by erring mortals, may it not, in some cases, be abused? Certainly it may, and often has been; but without the slightest injury done to the dignity, greatness, or power of the great spiritual Head of the Church, whose glory cannot be impaired by man's misconduct.

If authority in the Church be thus liable to abuse, and if, as we well know, such abuses have taken place, does it follow from this admission that the authority so abused was illegal altogether—that such power in the Church was an usurpation? There is no one in the possession of sound reasoning faculties,

we think, who will be so hardy as to maintain so absurd a position. Again, if the abuse of ecclesiastical power, on the part of a bishop, a synod of prelates, a convocation of elders, a council of presbyterian teachers, or a congregational democracy, does not necessarily prove that any one of these several parties was not vested with power in and over the Church; so neither will such an argument apply to power over ecclesiastic matters in *temporalities*, when vested in the Crown. The real state of the case is, that every civil government, whether monarchical, oligarchical, or democratical, whether favourable or hostile to Christianity, must exercise some degree of authority over the Church in temporal matters, over every organized Christian community within its dominions, because every member of such communities is a subject of that government. That which is inevitable, from the circumstances of human nature and the social condition of mankind, cannot be sinful or criminal, for the idea of criminality is inseparably connected with a *possibility* of avoiding the thing represented as criminal. The royal authority or supremacy, as in the old Christian kingdoms of Europe, is not precisely the same in any two of them. In all of them it is unlike the authority which the supreme government of the United States of America exercises over the multitudinous churches and Christian communities in that federal republic. And none of these resembles the controlling power of the Sultan over the Oriental churches, where the State is inimical to, and tolerates with impatience, and reluctantly, the existence of a Christian Church. Seeing, then, how extremely various is the kind of power exercised by the temporal government over the Church in different countries—by what a diversity of political and ecclesiastical influences it is necessarily controlled in them all, and more especially by public opinion—perceiving also that such a power on the part of the civil government necessarily exists in all, it becomes apparent that it is not the existence of such a power, but its excess or abuse, that is open to objection. A temporal supremacy, therefore, of the State, in matters ecclesiastical, is not to be condemned on *principle*, but in detail and particulars; and there must be proved to be unlawful usurpations, to involve powers hostile to civil and religious liberty, to imply an infringement on ecclesiastical rule, before a case can be fairly made out against the supremacy of the State in any particular instance. But we suspect that the enemies of Establishments will not exactly approve of the general manner in which we have couched the argument: they are much opposed to the royal supremacy, but probably have no objection to the same or even a higher supremacy in Church affairs, if it be in

the hands of a republican body. We hear of no complaints against the temporal supremacy in matters ecclesiastical in the United States, yet it exists there as well as in Great Britain, though in a different way. A political difference in the constitution of the governments which exercise the supremacy seems to make a wonderful difference in the estimation of this supremacy, according to the colouring which political predilections give to it. But surely, and in the name of common sense, if a wrong is done to the Church of Christ, and a personal outrage committed against the great spiritual Head of the Church, by entrusting secular men with power over the Church, a legislative control over Christian communities, can it make any difference *in principle* whether such supremacy be in the hands of a monarch, limited by law, or a republican assembly, whose momentary will is law?

Nor is this all that we have to take into consideration. Besides the supremacy over ecclesiastical matters, which, of one kind or other, rests with every supreme government, there is a species of supremacy of a more limited kind, and in a smaller sphere, exercised by other parties or individuals, according to their different functions, in subordination to that higher supremacy. This, too, is frequently inevitable; nay, more—it often, and that in the hands of the laity, involves authority in religion, of a spiritual as well as a temporal character, more than is the case when we regard the supremacy of the State. The government, we will say, is the temporal head of the Church; notwithstanding which, an archbishop, in a different sense, is the head of the Church in his own province—a bishop, in another sense, in his own diocese—a rector in his own parish—a schoolmaster in his own gymnasium—a father in his own family. The Wesleyan conference is the head of the Church to the whole body of Methodists—six or seven trustees are the head of the Church in an Unitarian chapel—and the pew-renters are omnipotent in controlling the temporal and spiritual affairs of a conventicle conducted on Independent principles. So that, if the exercise of power over ecclesiastical matters by secular men be unlawful and criminal, where are we to stop in our efforts to suppress it? Can we stay our hands in such a work of reform before we have rendered everything like authority and rule, order, regularity, and discipline, an absolute impossibility?

There is a great and manifest inconvenience encountered by those who would meet the arguments adduced by objectors to establishments of religion and the temporal supremacy of the State, arising from their vague and undefined language, their confused use of terms as synonymous which have different signi-

fications, and the negligence which they show in not clearly laying down the senses in which they use them. These causes render their language obscure, confuse the subject, and mislead the unwary. A considerable share of ignorance on the part of many of these writers increases the difficulty; first, of comprehending them, and secondly, of replying to them.

The advocates of what is improperly styled the voluntary principle object to the establishment of religion by the State, forgetting or taking care not to advert to the fact, that there are many ways in which religion, or some or several forms of religion, may be “established” by the civil power. Some of these persons write in such a strange manner, that one might almost infer that no condition of the Christian Church was lawful, except one of direct persecution by an antichristian government. And to some conclusion like this, indeed, every person may be easily driven, if he will not withdraw his denunciation against “all establishments of religion” by the temporal power. This, indeed, is too outrageous and absurd a position to be defended, or even held: but how, we would ask, can any one escape from this very inference, who declares that the condition and circumstances of the Church ought to be precisely those which existed in the first century, and that none others are reconcilable with the purity of Christ’s religion and Church? It might be a sufficient reply to persons who dogmatize after this fashion to say, that such a condition and such circumstances of the Church cannot occur again, even, what is not the case, should their recurrence be desirable. And that fact, if their assertion was correct, would go the full length of proving that the existence of a pure Church of Christ after the cessation of heathen persecution became an impossibility from the very nature of things—a result directly contrary to our Lord’s express promise of perpetuity to his Church. But no “*reductio ad absurdum*,” such as this, will produce any effect on the understandings of narrow-minded empirics in ecclesiastical affairs, whose thoughts can only be occupied with one idea on any subject bearing upon Church matters.

The existence, the construction, the designs, operations, and powers of the Church, can never be a matter of indifference to any government, whether friendly or hostile to Christianity. It can make no difference whether there be but one Church, or several discordant Churches, in the country, or whether the constitution of the government be monarchical, aristocratical, republican, or mixed. In any case, and in all cases, the proceedings ^{to} the Church or Churches exercising a spiritual power over ^{san} whole mass of the subjects, and to some extent over their

rulers, cannot possibly be a matter of slight importance to the government. The State, if inimical to the influence of Christianity, and alarmed by the authority which it is able to exert, independent of the civil power, and derived from a different source from human law, will always persecute the Church, and endeavour to suppress it. If favourable to the moral restraints of Christianity—if impressed with its truth, and conscious of its beneficial assistance to lawfully constituted authority, the State will protect the Church, exert itself to amplify her means of doing good, and bind itself in close friendship with an institution so eminently serviceable to mankind. One of these two must, therefore, happen—either friendship and protection to the Church from the State, or hostility and persecution. These may be modified according to circumstances, but one of the two alternatives *must* take place. Absolute indifference on the part of the State is impossible. It never did, and it never can exist.

Such being undeniably the case, which of these two positions of the Church is most desirable, that of friendly relation to the secular government, or that which exposes it to the harsh and violent resentment of implacably hostile rulers? Which of them is most consonant to the will of God—to the Scriptures—to the designs of Christ? Which of them is most conducive to the welfare of the Church—to the extension of our Lord's spiritual empire—to the salvation of souls? Every one in the possession of his senses will say the former. But in that case, if the decided preference be given to that position of the Church which alone is compatible with peace on earth and good will to man, an establishment of the Christian Church will be found inevitable. For the friendship of the secular power implies its protection of the Church and the Church's property—it implies State patronage of the Church and Churchmen; it will be accompanied by encouragement for men of wealth to devote, from their superabundant affluence, a certain portion towards the maintenance of the Church. And can we imagine that the powerful and the opulent, who hold the reins of a government which is thus friendly to the Church, will not themselves set an example of such liberality? Such a government will necessarily legislate for the Church to a greater or less extent: indeed, its protection of the Church implies as much. It will probably be anxious to admit the rulers of the Church into its councils, to assist its deliberations by their wisdom and piety, or to watch over the Church's interests in the Legislature. These, in the lapse of time, are results which will probably occur; and, from all that we know of human nature, may be calculated upon with tolerable certainty. Thus, from the simple circumstance of the

government's friendly disposition to Christianity, we arrive by a most natural process at a perfect establishment of the Christian Church, or of several Christian Churches, by the law of the land; and something perhaps more than this—an alliance between the Church and State, as a constitutional maxim; the laws regulating both becoming at last so inextricably blended together, that it is impossible to separate them without demolishing both.

It is to be observed here that the question is not, whether the secular power shall legislate on matters which affect the welfare the Church or not, for that it will and must do, since, as we have shown, it cannot be indifferent to the Church; but the question is, whether the government shall be friendly or hostile to it. A persecuting power will legislate by confiscation, fines, imprisonment, capital punishment, and other modes of persecution and oppression. A friendly state will legislate by protection, by assistance, and every species of encouragement. But each of them *will* legislate in one way or the other. If, therefore, the advocates of the voluntary principle think fit to assert that the government's presuming to legislate for the Church in ecclesiastical affairs (spiritual matters being excluded) is an usurpation of divine power, and is antichristian—they tacitly assert, at the same time, the absolute impossibility of any true Church existing in the world, since every government, whether friendly to the Church or not, always will and must legislate on points vitally affecting the Church's welfare. Here is another "*reductio ad absurdum*."

We may go a little further. Are the parties, who are accustomed to make these hasty and inconsiderate tirades against the establishment of Christianity by the State, prepared to assent and adhere to the following position, viz., that direct persecution of the Church by a wicked government, who attempts its extirpation by every kind of injustice, cruelty, and ingenious torture, is a posture of affairs pleasing to God, perfectly correct, allowable and desirable?—and that the protection of the Church by a Christian government, which gratefully encourages and facilitates its beneficial operations, is contrary to the divine will, hateful to the great spiritual Head of the Church, and to be reprobated as an impious conversion of Christ's kingdom into one of this world? Can human absurdity, or wild fanaticism, go to further lengths than this? Yet to this must the ultra-voluntaries come at last, unless they repudiate the premises which they have hitherto avowed.

To confess the truth, we are considerably at a loss to know what the Dissenters mean when they object to a Church Establishment. We wish Mr. Burnet, or some other of their

itinerant orators, would enlighten us by a definition on this subject. We have always considered that every Church is established where the State is friendly to it, affords it protection, and gives it encouragement, even though it may not impart pecuniary resources from the public exchequer. For in such a case (as indeed in every case) the state legislates for such a Church : and what more can be wanted to constitute an establishment of religion ? Every Dissenting *Church* in Great Britain and Ireland is established by the law of the land, though not in the precise manner in which the United Church of England and Ireland, and the Kirk of Scotland, are established. Every Protestant Church in France is established by the law of the land ; every Christian Church in the United States of America is also an establishment by the law of the land. We grant that there are many different modes in which Churches may be established by law. But these are only modifications and degrees of the same thing ; and the objection is brought, not to the degree or the extent to which the principle is carried, but *in toto* to the principle itself, to any and all establishments.

There is no difference whatever between the friendly disposition of the British government towards the different *Churches* which exist in the empire. The Church of England did not derive her revenues or temporal property from the State, any more than did the Presbyterian, Independent, or Quaker communities. All restrictive laws have been removed which could bear an interpretation of distrust and jealousy. The Dissenters have received large grants of money from the treasury for the purpose of conducting religious education according to their own views of religious truth. In the civil list, we annually find a charge of many thousands per annum paid out of the public taxes directly to the maintenance of Dissenting ministers.

The acceptance of these large sums of public money on the part of these Dissenters, who are perpetually haranguing on the propriety of every Church supporting itself, without taking cash from those who are not members of it, does certainly appear, to our judgment, to savour somewhat of inconsistency, and seems to render them liable to the imputation of hypocrisy. But, with all these facts before the eyes of the public, what right have they to complain of unequal treatment—with what plausible colouring can they take up their parable so vehemently against establishments of religion ?

By far the most plausible, and in our opinion the most efficient, argument which the Dissenting polemical writers have advanced against the union between the Church and the State

is this—that such an incorporation must have a tendency to make the clergy a worldly and merely secular body, dependent on the State and disposed to servility towards the government, and to render the dignitaries of the Church politicians, rather than pastors of Christ's flock. And certainly, *primâ facie*, considering the infirmities and weaknesses of human nature, no result can theoretically appear more plausible than this. But laying theory aside, as every honest Englishman instinctively does when he wishes to arrive at the naked truth, and looking at the practical working of the system, what is the fact? Our national clergy are not addicted to politics, but the very reverse—intently and zealously employed in their ministerial labours. For one clergyman who is notorious for meddling with elections, for publishing political pamphlets, or speechifying at county meetings, you will find a dozen of Dissenting teachers who seem to live but for such avocations, in a thick and unwholesome atmosphere of political agitation. It is not true—so untrue, that we never heard the thing mentioned, save hypothetically, as probable—it is not true that our bishops are warm politicians or servile courtiers, although, as members of the Legislature, they would neglect their duty to the country were they to overlook or be indifferent to the measures of the State.

While such is the fact, and the test of practical reality utterly disproves the argument of the Dissenters, what, we would seriously ask, is the state of the case, if we turn the tables and examine the conduct of Dissenting teachers on this very head? Do we find them invariably, or even generally, so intently bent on the work of the ministry, so indefatigable in winning souls to Christ, and directing them heavenward, that they have no time, and still less inclination, to mix themselves with secular affairs and what may be passing in the world of politics? Very far otherwise. As canvassers at county and borough elections, as orators on the hustings, at political dinners, at meetings for the avowed purpose of getting up some ephemeral agitation on the passing topics of political interest, who are so active, zealous, and adroit as these self-styled ambassadors of Christ? On these occasions you are as sure to see an Unitarian or Independent preacher foremost in enthusiasm, as you are unlikely to find a clergyman of the Church of England. It was but the other day that these pious and abstracted ministers of the Gospel met, to the number of above two hundred, in Manchester; for the godly purpose of aiding the Anti-Corn-Law League (“conspiracy” it ought to be called) in their scheme to ruin the farmers and agricultural labourers of England, and effect the utter destruction of the landed interest. Here was

a question purely political, the due consideration of which involved many difficult statistical details, the whole of our foreign relations, and the state of our trade, of all which these *soi-disant* reverend gentlemen were profoundly ignorant. Thoroughly and exclusively political though it was, the repeal of the corn laws was a measure promoted by an administration which was supposed to have done much good to the Dissenters, and might do more by certain political innovations which they were desirous to behold; and therefore they must, in their extreme necessity, be supported by all the influence the Dissenters could exert. Therefore the plan of convoking all the Dissenting teachers, to fulminate an anathema against the corn laws, was formed. Therefore, although they never exerted themselves on the subject before, and felt their consciences perfectly easy during that long silence, some hundreds of them congregate at Manchester (the fittest place certainly for dispassionate enquiry, and one which an anchorite might covet for that purpose), with profuse declarations that the subject was in a peculiar sense scriptural, to be decided by the word of God, and therefore most fitted for their holy tribunal. Some few simple souls were deluded by this absurd representation, in which there was as much blasphemy as folly, and proposed that the proceedings of their synod should commence with prayer for God's blessing. But this was too much even for the leaders, the case-hardened standard-bearers of this solemn mockery. It was an impiety, for which even they were not prepared, to kneel down and ask a benediction from the God of peace and love, when they knew that they were met for the purpose of mere party politics, to aid the designs of a desperate faction, and with their hearts full of rancour and malice. The proposal was, we are informed, negatived, on the plausible ground that no prayer could be devised which would suit the opinions ("consciences" was the phrase) of the representatives of so many sects who held no one religious doctrine in common. The proposal to open the proceedings with prayer was negatived; but not without opening the eyes of those unsuspecting and deluded individuals who had brought it forward, and who then discovered what kind of spirit animated that sectarian pandemonium which they had been seduced to enter. We do not believe that anything was calculated more seriously to injure the Dissenting interest throughout Great Britain than this convocation of ministers at Manchester. The expressions "trading Dissenters" and "political Dissenters" can never be repudiated as inappropriate after this most disgraceful exhibition.

The history of Dissent has been hitherto written only by Dissenters; and, therefore, there is no history of them on which

we can rely for accuracy. But, even written as it has been, their entire history is one of the political proceedings, political factions and feuds, which have disturbed the country ever since the Reformation. They have lived upon political agitation—they have mixed themselves up with it, and have been foremost in it, whenever a particular party could be induced to serve their purposes by the promise of their assistance. And so completely did they rely on political changes to work out their own ends, that they hailed the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts as the signal of their triumph and the downfall of the Church of England. These are the people who object to the union between Church and State, because it is calculated to secularize the clergy, and involve them in politics! Oh! that they could but see themselves in the same light in which they are viewed by all England; for the eyes of all are now fixed upon them with regret and astonishment. A whole century of moderation and wisdom will not regain to the cause of English Dissent what they have lost in public esteem and respect during the last twelve years. Of this moral retrogradation there were symptoms abundant throughout the country, sufficiently unequivocal to have deterred any body of men, who were not labouring under a judicial infatuation, from so ruinous a procedure as the “ministerial conference” at Manchester.

We must, however, take some further notice of the pamphlets which appear at the head of this article.

The *Rev.* John Burnet is a writer of a different calibre of mind, both from Mr. Sanderson and the majority of Dissenting agitators on the voluntary system. His style of composition is flowing, easy, and not ungraceful; and, from his mode of managing his subject, we infer that his understanding is clear and his judgment penetrating. This, however, is little praise to Mr. Burnet, when we find him arranging and disposing his arguments in such a manner as to perplex the understanding and confuse the judgment of his unlearned hearers and readers.

We have here a word of advice for the benefit of these itinerant crusaders of the voluntary principle. They are the emissaries of a society for the advocacy of this said principle, which is, in fact, neither more nor less than an organized conspiracy to preach and talk down the Church of England, as a compulsory and not a voluntary Church. In carrying out the views of this disinterested body of men, it came to pass, in the due course of things, that Mr. Burnet delivered, at Hertford, the “Lecture” on which we are now animadverting. But, then, such persons ought to be on their guard to do nothing which shall be prejudicial to the cause which they advocate. They should take special care to commit no act which can tend to show off, in daylight and in

full relief, the weak parts of their system, and unfold to those whose homage to it they would gain all the little artifices which are requisite for its support and plausibility—the unproved assumptions—the falsification of history—the false principles, tacitly taken for granted—the *petitio principii*—the “argumentum à possibili ad esse,” as the schoolmen called it—the lame syllogism which limps on three legs—the indignant invective against an unfelt or imaginary grievance. Now all these, to an unlettered and simple audience, may pass very well, and escape detection, when they are properly assisted by the ready elocution, the winning earnestness of manner, and vehement gesticulations of such declaimers, without taking into consideration that peculiar ornate redundancy of style which they know to be so captivating to itching ears. This may do well enough, and escape the vigilance of critical scrutiny or severe logic; but it is very different when they come to print and publish these effusions. Such men as Mr. Burnet and his confederates seem to forget the wish expressed by the pious and afflicted man, when suffering under the calumny of his foes, “Oh! that mine adversary had *written a book*.” Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar knew better than to do any such thing: they kept to talking. But not so Mr. Burnet and his compeers. The calumniated Church of England has cause of congratulation that her adversaries have taken to writing books, which people can read and examine at their leisure; and she knows that the people of England are incapable of any continued delusion when that is the case. We honestly tell these gentlemen of the “*Evangelical Voluntary Church Association*” that they are doing more to damage their own crazy cause, by printing and circulating such tracts as Mr. Burnet’s “*Lecture*,” than the Church of England could accomplish were all her learned divines arrayed in controversial panoply against them. Every ten thousand copies of such slipshod trash, which they circulate at the expense of their own voluntary purses, tells incalculably in favour of the Church against which their malice is levelled.

We shall give a few extracts from this production, which will, in our opinion, substantiate what we have said—at least, to any person of common sense and ordinary intelligence.

Mr. Burnet tells us (p. 4) that Christianity “is not a political system,” meaning thereby that it has no reference to politics; yet, with the interval of only six lines, he admits that it commands Christians “to obey the powers that be,” which is totally contradictory to the assertion, that Christianity has no reference to politics, in which sense Mr. Burnet used the semi-ambiguous phrase, that it is not a political system. Of course it is not

a political system, by preferring one form of political government to another; being calculated to flourish equally under monarchy, oligarchy, or democracy, by the peculiar constitution which the great Head of the Church has given to it. But every religion in the world, Christianity being no exception, is necessarily connected, more or less, with the political institutions of the countries where it is found, and that in many more particulars than obedience to the existing laws. As the orator did think it necessary, for decency's sake, to advert to the holy text, it would have been more graceful had he exemplified the duty by exhorting his hearers to pay church-rates cheerfully, while the law on that subject remains what it is, than to have used the expression "political system" in an equivocal manner.

There is a somewhat similar artifice in the same page:—

"Not a word of any description of political government will be found laid down and recommended in the New Testament Scriptures. Everything on these subjects is left to the various nations upon earth, respectively to choose and construct their own economy."

Here Mr. Burnet in the same breath represents Scripture as silent and speaking—a very gross though covert contradiction in terms. How can Scripture both say "*not a word*" about political institutions, and at the same time give directions that the people are to "*choose*" their own forms of political economy? This is a superlative Iricism: but perhaps Mr. Burnet may have a privilege to be rather *green* on such subjects, if he be, as we surmise, a native of the Emerald Isle. We beg to assure Mr. Burnet, that he will find *not a word* in Scripture to the effect that the people are to choose their own institutions. They are commanded to obey those which are in existence, but *not a word* is said as to the mode in which they came into existence, or the process by which their existence may be lawfully terminated. Mr. Burnet's intellectual candle is not large enough to allow of its burning at both ends at the same time. It was pertinent to his subject to observe and point out to his hearers the fact, that Christianity favours no particular mode of government in preference to others, but unfortunately he was too much of a party man—too much of a "political Dissenter," not to shove in a neutral phrase which should imply, to the apprehension of a careless audience, that the people were authorized to "choose" their own political institutions and select their own governors. Surely, if prudential motives did not restrain him from *speaking* such nonsense, the palpable contradiction should have withheld him from venturing to *print* it.

But Mr. Burnet proceeds (p. 5), in reference to the same sub-

ject, viz., the indifference of Christianity to the various forms of government that may exist, to observe as follows:—

“In revealing the Christian system, he (God) gave a system adapted to all time, and, let me add, to all eternity. The man who touches Christianity, therefore—who touches the revelation from heaven—tells us thereby that this revelation is imperfect and ill-adapted to meet the circumstances in which man is placed: and, professing to give to it a better character, he meddles in its details, alters its institutions, and brings out what he thinks ‘an improved edition,’ the result of human interference, and marked with human infirmity. Now we regard such interference as highly presumptuous. We should take revelation as it came from heaven.”

Really this is too ridiculous. What Scripture says of politics, and the relative situation of the Church to political institutions, is just, according to Mr. Burnet’s own statement, “not a word”—nothing! The old proverb, “ex nihilo fit nihil,” seems not to be much respected by Mr. Burnet: he makes a great deal out of this nothing. The passage which we have quoted is manifestly directed against the establishment of a Christian Church (*i. e.*, its protection by the civil power), or against an alliance between Church and State—one or both of these. Any such thing, according to him, is “touching Christianity”—“touching the revelation from heaven”—representing revelation as “imperfect and ill-adapted to meet the circumstances in which man is placed”—meddling in the “details” of Christ’s religion—“altering its institutions”—and, in short, is “conduct highly presumptuous.” Why, in the name of common sense, has not this *ne plus ultra* Hibernian most satisfactorily shown that any such procedure is a touching of “nothing,” meddling with “nothing,” altering “nothing,” and presuming upon “nothing,” inasmuch as he gravely tells us that on all these points Christianity has said “nothing,” no, “not a word?” But we suppose there are minds so peculiarly constituted, of such a remarkably compacted intellectual idiosyncrasy, as to accept all this trash as sound logic and conclusive reasoning. To ordinary capacities and judgments not utterly sublimated by transcendental mysticism it would have appeared natural to infer, from the avowed indifference of Christianity to political institutions, that it was specially so arranged by a wise Providence, in order that a religion intended for all mankind, and under all imaginable circumstances, might impart its benefits and blessings to all governments alike, be able to amalgamate and ally itself with them all equally—who would have concluded from such premises, that a government, whose chief duty it is to provide for the well being of its people, was bound to care nothing for their

religion, and patronize impartially every form of it which may spring into existence, whatever its precepts, whatever its impostures, whatever its moral consequences might be. We tell Mr. Burnet, and all his disciples in the school of voluntarism, that the "powers that be," which are "ordained of God," are bound, by the nature of their delegated trust, to serve God by maintaining and aiding his cause by the diffusion of his truth; and, moreover, that every governing earthly power that fails to do this, or sets up falsehood or atheism in the place of God's truth, "GOD WILL JUDGE." And the world has witnessed not a few specimens of such judgments.

Nothing is easier than dishonesty; and there is no dishonest trick easier or more common in argument than to represent your opponent as maintaining principles which he never advanced. Mr. Burnet deals largely in this method of controversial tactics. Mr. Burnet has expended three pages for the purpose of proving that an establishment of religion by law will not operate upon the minds of men to convince them of the truth of Christianity, or supersede the necessity of a body of evidences to prove its truth. Who ever pretended that it would? We are ignorant that any person writing upon the subject ever advanced such an idiotic position. Mr. Burnet takes upon himself to favour us with the following original statement, the concoction of his own wisdom:—

"Creeds may, just as a volume may, be circulated: but what I take to be the basis on which all principle rests—*conviction*—never can be created unless the individuals are impressed and instructed; and if the intellect is impressed and instructed, there is no necessity for threatening or bribing into an expression of conviction."

Is this sheer ignorance, or malice? Does Mr. Burnet require to be informed that creeds are not intended to *convince* unbelievers, but to express the faith of believers—that they are confessions of faith exhibiting the immemorial judgment of the Church on points of disputed doctrine? And what *abuse* of the present times does he mean to allude to when he vapours so ostentatiously about "threatening or bribing into an expression of conviction?"

Mr. Burnet, warming with his subject, becomes somewhat bolder; and pursuing the same plan, gets on with equal facility. As *Hamlet* says, "'Tis as easy as lying."

He assumes that an establishment of religion by the State is maintained on the plea that men will give money spontaneously for its support—a mode of reasoning certainly new to us. "I am told (says he, page 10) that a man who loves Christianity above all things will not give his money for its diffusion till he

is compelled." Now no person ever advanced such reasoning as this; and in England nothing could possibly be more preposterous, and glaringly contradicted by facts, than such a statement. All the endowments of our churches, cathedrals, and colleges proceed from voluntary benefactions, the free gifts of individuals in their private capacity. Nothing in history can be more notorious. There certainly can be assigned no limits to possible human folly; and we cannot pretend to surmise the intellectual qualifications of all the parties whom Mr. Burnet may have met in oral controversy. But certainly no respectable author, no writer of any character or consideration in the republic of letters, ever "told" Mr. Burnet that Englishmen, "loving Christianity above all things, will not give their money for its diffusion till they are compelled."

The *suppressio veri* is almost as profitable an engine in Mr. Burnet's hands as *suppositio falsi*. Of the religious communities which are constructed on the voluntary principle, Mr. Burnet says—

"Instead of their not being willing to support Christianity, they have grown so strong, without the State support, that the State itself cannot put them down. And those who feel strongly on the other side of the question come forward—for what? Just because they are afraid of this voluntary community, and they cry out for a proper degree of hardy administration from the State to put down this community. Here, then, you have a voluntary community so far from falling into decay, that it has become so strong—their enemies themselves being judges—that they are obliged to hold meetings all over the country to cry out against it, and to warn the empire against the danger from this hardy, sturdy, numerous race, who have risen from mere *voluntaryism*—and a voluntaryism which is not likely to die a natural death; so they are compelled to wish the State to execute a kind of political murder to get rid of it." "Let us, then, hear no more of the weakness of the voluntary principle: let it have fair play." (p. 11).

The author-orator ought, in fairness, to have told his readers and hearers that these virtuous and disinterested Voluntaries have been petitioning the Legislature for the confiscation of all Church property under the designation of national property. This fact he has suppressed. This object they have avowed in their petitions to Parliament from all parts of the three kingdoms; and this will surely account reasonably enough for counter petitions being sent up "all over the country" against this flagitious demand. Every line in the above extract contains a condensed falsehood. We are told that the voluntary (*i. e.*, Dissenting) Churches have grown "so strong, *without State support*," although Parliament votes many thousands a year for the

maintenance of Dissenting ministers. We are told that the State *cannot* put them down, that we may suppose that the State would crush them if it were able; though the same *regium donum* is rather a substantial indication of a contrary disposition, to say nothing of a grant of money from the treasury to build Dissenting schools, continued session after session. We are told that the friends of the British Constitution in Church and State call upon the State to put down these voluntary communities, and commit a political murder to get rid of them; which declaration we hesitate not to stigmatize as a deliberate and nefarious fabrication.

So long as these self-styled voluntary communities (for they are not truly and exclusively voluntary, so long as the above grants have existed) continue to create an agitation in the country to compass their conspiracy of Church plunder, they shall be resisted; and we assure them they shall not have the "fair play" they ask for, which means the Church's acquiescence in their nefarious project. And Mr. Burnet must make up his mind to hear much more of the "weakness of the voluntary principle," unless he determines to read no more on that subject: and he requires to be instructed, that, when we speak of its weakness, we do not mean to intimate a feebleness of numerical power, or an imbecility in creating the force which numerical superiority might at some future period enable them to wield; but a weakness proved and demonstrated by experience and reiterated tests, inherent in the system, whereby it is utterly incompetent to carry out the salutary objects which it professes to accomplish.

We have but to notice one atrocity committed by this writer, and we have done with him. After setting up a caricature description of the Church of England, which he describes as a "definition" of a Church Establishment—though any such definition ought to include every Dissenting community in the empire—and after showing how it applies, point by point, he concludes very complacently as follows:—

"I think I have now shown you, from the institution of our National Establishment, that my definition is correct, with the exception of one item, namely, that the Church is maintained by force of law; and I have not dwelt on that point, because there is no dispute about it: we all know that the Church is so maintained."

Mr. Burnet does not here mean, by the word "maintained," that the Book of Common Prayer is part and parcel of the law of the land, or that the bishops are nominated by the Crown, or that the sovereign is the temporal head of the Church. All these he had spoken of before, and had retailed the old, often

refuted, stale arguments on these several points. Neither by "maintained" did he mean the protection of Church property by the laws, for Dissenting Church property is equally protected by the State. Neither did he mean a remedy by law in cases of defamation or libel, for Dissenters can and do avail themselves of this remedy by indictment, as in the case of the Scorton nunnery. But he meant, most obviously, that the Church property by which the clergy of the Church of England are maintained took its origin from the State—was given to the Church by an act of the Legislature, and is in this sense "national property." This is the falsehood which he desired to infuse into his hearers' minds when he made the audacious assertion, that the Church is "maintained by force of law:" and he has the impudence to say "there is no dispute about it." Now nothing can be surer, as an historical fact, than that the property which maintains the English clergy was *not* bestowed by the State, but was the result of private benefaction—the gratuitous munificence of the pious and wealthy in former times. If there is no dispute about it, can a better reason be found than this—that the fact is notorious? But while Mr. Burnet, and people equally unscrupulous, are giving the lie to history, and falsifying the records of antiquity, in defence of their own modern theories of Church property, surely it is high time that some author of competent learning should step forward, and prove to the world, in detail, that neither tithes nor glebe lands were the gift of the State, and that the Church is not maintained by grants of national property.

We must, however, offer a few words of remark on Mr. Sanderson's Letter to the Primate. What we have already laid before our readers, respecting this individual's lucubrations, will not have prepared them to expect many indications of good taste or sound judgment. But they could not thence have anticipated the utter absence of all sense of decency and propriety, the shameless scurrility, the unfeeling brutality, which pervade this Letter. We cannot soil our pages with a single quotation. As a partizan of the voluntary school, this writer is imbued with all the virulence and ferocity of the modern Scotch Secession Church; but, unfortunately for himself, he is destitute of their clearness of language and vigour of style. He can bark, and show his teeth, but cannot bite. His abuse can injure no one's character but his own. He has no genius whatever for controversy; and he exhibits his feebleness most when he intends to be especially severe. His style is very bad—almost below criticism—inaccurate, careless in the extreme, and indescribably slovenly. His occasional indistinctness, and the shapeless dis-

order of his sentences, render him very obscure. He has managed to combine totally opposite vices in literary composition. He betrays consummate vanity, without a particle of self-respect. He boasts of his acquirements, and yet compels his reader to despise him. He is at once imbecile and malicious; turgid and weak; arrogant and mean; flippant and most woefully dull. The only faults which he possesses without their direct opposites are hatred and insolence. To use the expression applied by an honest Irish gentleman to one who habitually thwarted his own best interests, Mr. Sanderson is a dismal specimen of "a man turning his back upon himself;" for we really think no person of any kindliness of disposition can possibly read this letter without inferring that the author's character is a compound of all kinds of odious qualities.

According to Mr. Sanderson's own account of himself, he attained at Oxford "almost every honour which that University had to bestow, including two out of four annual prizes—the first class in classical learning, and a fellowship at Oriel"—"a prize essay, in 1814," when the allied sovereigns visited that seat of learning, "and when (he modestly tells us) the prizes were not meanly contested." Unquestionably some very remarkable singularities have come forth out of Oriel in modern times; but certainly we never could have expected it to have given birth to so curious a variety of the class mammalia—which Linnæus has arranged under the genus and species *HOMO SAPIENS*—as this Mr. Sanderson. Yet he ought to have reflected that, as Oxford had conferred every honour which she had to bestow on him, a reciprocal obligation to do some honour to Oxford (and Oriel too) rested with him.

How far such a feeling of gratitude has influenced him, our readers may gather from the following morsels, culled out of this precious Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, perpetrated by this Oxford prizeman:—

"When they *were* done with their tools they laid them aside." (p. 7).

"We *are* now done, my lord, with the intrusion of the State into the Church; and turn, therefore, at once, to another branch of the subject." (p. 17).

"*Whom and when* they are to succeed, I leave to your Grace's own judgment." (p. 20).

"Let it not be an obstacle to this interpretation, my lord, the outbreak of Puseyism within the period prescribed; for your Grace must know, &c." (p. 21).

"They will not submit, *I say*, much longer, *I believe*, to have the office of," &c. (p. 24).

Assuredly if the author of such sentences as these, the construction of which would disgrace a schoolboy's first theme, ever *could* write good vernacular English, he has irretrievably lost the faculty. This is the man who boasts of having obtained almost all the honours, prizes, &c., which Oxford had to bestow—a fellowship at Oriel included. Clearly, if he intends to make himself memorable as a scholar or an author, he must turn over a new leaf in his common-place book, and begin to learn his English accidence again. If he do not alter his mode of composition, so as to “reform it altogether,” he may merit the sepulchral inscription which covers the ashes of another member of the same renowned society:—

“Underneath lies Gabriel Snellow,
Of Oriel College sometime fellow;
Of him there nothing is memorial,
Except that he was fellow of Oriel.”

Enough of Mr. Sanderson's sins against good taste, good English, and good grammar. He has enabled us fortunately to contrast these peccadilloes with his virtues. To give us a proper idea of the amiable disposition which particularly distinguishes him, he assures us that he did his best to embitter the last living moments of his venerable uncle, the late Lord Eldon, when the faculties of that pious, excellent, and upright statesman were giving way to the united agency of senility and disease. Speaking of Lord Eldon's death-bed, Mr. Sanderson thus describes his own affectionate, considerate, and praiseworthy conduct on the occasion:—

“When reminded by some one (with the kindest intentions, no doubt), a few days before his decease, of his great political consistency, he replied, ‘Say no more to me, sir, of consistency: I have been either decidedly right, or decidedly wrong.’ And in truth, my lord, I believe he began to suspect that he had been ‘decidedly wrong.’ Certain it is that I myself spared no pains to undeceive him; and I am the more confirmed in the opinion I entertain from what occurred on the day of his death. Being told of the coldness of the weather (for it was the very coldest day of a very cold season), he said, ‘It signifies little to me, sir, whether it be hot or cold; I shall soon be in a different climate.’”

We have no more to say respecting Mr. Sanderson, ex-fellow of Oriel, save that he appears to be a very poor creature, and a mean, dastardly fellow. All Oriel cannot convince us to the contrary.

But we must, in conclusion, advert to the practice, now becoming much too common, of putting controversial pamphlets into the shape of letters addressed to persons whose sentiments

are opposed to those of the writer, and whose peculiar situation precludes them from making a reply. Our bishops are particularly subject to the provoking attacks, and these parties from whom the nuisance proceeds usually take advantage of the prelate's inability to retaliate, by an extra degree of affected familiarity or downright insolence. Such conduct resembles that of the recruiting captain, who, for some imaginary offence, sent a challenge to a canon of Christ Church. It is the act of a coward to make an ostentatious display of bravery and defiance to one whose hands are tied. No gentleman can be capable of such conduct under any circumstances: and the gentle, mild character of our revered Primate, not less than the respect due to his high and holy office, ought to have been an effectual protection against such an outrage.

ART. VI.—*Deus, Natura, Gratia. Sive Tractatus, de Prædestinatione, de Meritis, et peccatorum remissione, seu de Iustificatione, et denique de Sanctorum Inuocatione. Ubi ad trutinam Fidei Catholicæ examinatur Confessio Anglicana et ad singula puncta, quid teneat, qualiter differat, excutitur. Accessit Paraphrastica Expositio reliquorum Articulorum Confessionis Anglicanæ. Per FR. FRANCISCUM A SANCTA CLARA Lugduni, M.DC.XXXIV. Cum Priuilegio Regis et Approbatione Doctorum. 4to.*

2. *No. 90, Tracts for the Times. Second edition. London. 1841. 8vo.*
3. *Brief Remarks upon No. 90, second edition, and some Subsequent Publications in Defence of it. By the Rev. P. C. GOLIGHTLY, M.A. Oxford. 1841. 8vo.*
4. *The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly Represented; in Answer to a Book entitled "A Papist Represented and Misrepresented." By EDWARD STILLINGFLEET, D.D., Bishop of Worcester. A new edition, with an Introduction and Notes. By WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM. Edinburgh. 1837. 18mo.*
5. *A Letter on Catholic Unity, addressed to the Right Hon. the Earl of Shrewsbury. By NICHOLAS, Bishop of Melipotamus. London. 1841. 8vo.*
6. *A Second Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., in reference to his Letter to the Rev. W. Jelf, D.D. By GEORGE MILLER, D.D. London. 1841. 8vo.*
7. *A Short Enquiry into the Doctrine of the Churches of*

England and of Rome, and the Authority of Scripture on the Points of Difference between them. By a Lay Member of the Established Church. Second edition. Loughborough and London. 1841. 12mo.

8. *Faith, Hope, and Charity.* Extract from a Sermon preached at the Dedication of the Catholic Chapel, at Bradford, on Wednesday, July 27th, 1825 (and republished by the Catholic Institute in 1840), by Peter Augustine Baines, D.D., Bishop of Siga, &c. ; or, the Bishop's Appeal to the Catholic Church against the Pope and the Church of Rome, founded upon Holy Scripture, contrasted with Quotations from the Missal and Breviary, and other approved Authorities, and Books of Devotion in the Church of Rome. London. 1841. 12mo.
9. *A Charge delivered at his Ordinary Visitation in September, 1840.* By WILLIAM, LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. London. 1841. 8vo.
10. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham, at the Visitation in July and August, 1841.* By EDWARD, LORD BISHOP OF DURHAM. London. 1841. 8vo.
11. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Winchester, in 1841.* By CHARLES RICHARD SUMNER, D.D., BISHOP OF WINCHESTER. London. 1841. 8vo.
12. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln, by JOHN, LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN, at the Triennial Visitation in 1840.* London. 1840. 8vo.
13. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Chester, at the Visitation in June and September, 1841.* By the Right Rev. JOHN BIRD, LORD BISHOP OF CHESTER. London. 1841. 8vo.
14. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol, at his Visitation in August and September, 1841.* By the Right Rev. JAMES HENRY, LORD BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL. London. 1841. 8vo.
15. *Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter, by the Right Rev. HENRY, LORD BISHOP OF EXETER, at the Triennial Visitation in the months of August, September, and October, 1839.* London. 1839. 8vo.
16. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Ripon, at his Triennial Visitation in July and August, 1841.* By the Right Rev. CHARLES THOMAS, LORD BISHOP OF RIPON. London. 1841. 8vo.
17. *The Thirty-nine Articles considered as the Standard and*

Test of the Doctrines of the Church of England, chiefly with Reference to the Views of No. 90 of the Tracts for the Times : a Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford, in the Divinity School, on Thursday, June 3rd, 1841. By GODFREY FAUSSETT, D. D., Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity, and Canon of Christ Church. Oxford. 1841. 8vo.

IT is an old artifice of the advocates of Popery to attempt to get rid of the most offensive dogmas peculiar to the Romish Church, either by asserting that they are misunderstood, or by *relaxing* their interpretations of them—in other words, by explaining them away wherever they can, or by glossing them over with fallacious and subtle explications or evasions. During the lives of the first Reformers, indeed (hundreds of whom suffered at the stake for the pure faith of Christ), as well as of the generation which immediately succeeded them, this artifice could not be attempted with much prospect of success; for the true character of Popery was then too well known to render it politic in its supporters to misrepresent its peculiar tenets. During the sixteenth century, therefore, the advocates of Rome defended their cause as well as they could; but, being foiled by the arguments of their learned opponents, they soon found it expedient to allege that their tenets were misunderstood and misrepresented; and, at the same time, they endeavoured insidiously to soften down, or to explain away, their absurdity. As modern Papists have had recourse to the same disingenuous artifice, we think—at least, we hope—that we shall render some little service to the cause of true religion and of our Church by offering to our readers a concise account of the principal efforts which have been made, at various times, in order to deceive unwary Protestants into a belief that there is very little difference between the tenets respectively held by them and by Papists.

1. One of the earliest of these insidious attempts, perhaps the very earliest, is the treatise entitled “*Devs, Natura, Gratia*,” &c. (No. 1 of the publications at the head of this article), composed by Christopher Davenport, *alias* Francis Coventry, *alias* Francis Hunt, who was one of the Popish chaplains of Henrietta, Queen of Charles I., and who, on becoming a Franciscan friar, assumed the appellation of FRANCISCUS A SANCTA CLARA, by which he is best known. This treatise (which is now of very rare occurrence*) was published at Lyons in 1634, the

* Copies of it are in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, and in the Library of Sion College, London.

very year in which King Charles I. (to whom he dedicated it) began to be embroiled with the English nation by his arbitrary exaction of ship-money. It was fortified by seven recommendations of Romish theologians, who testified that they found nothing in it contrary to the faith of the Romish Church; and it consists of thirty-seven problems, at the end of which is his Paraphrastic Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Confession of Faith, in which he endeavours to show, with regard to such of them as are plainly levelled against Popish tenets, *but in which Popery is NOT expressly mentioned*, that the doctrine of the Church of England, when rightly understood (that is, according to the Franciscan's subtle glosses and explications), did not substantially differ from that of the Church of Rome. With regard to those Articles, in which certain Popish tenets are expressly condemned by name, he laboured to prove that the compilers of them did not correctly understand what the doctrine of the Romish Church, on these points, really was; that they condemned only an imagination of their own; and that, if they had known the true doctrines of Popery upon these topics, they would have represented them in a different way. Davenport vindicates his mode of treating the points which he has discussed by the authority of Coster, Vega, Thomas à Jesu, and Melchior Canus. We have not room for many specimens of Davenport's subtle explanations of Popery; but we have been so much struck with certain coincidences between them, and some of the expository glosses offered by Mr. Newman, in the Tract No. 90, that we cannot withhold them from our readers.

(1.) *Invocation of Saints.* Having stated and endeavoured to vindicate the doctrine of the Romish Church, Francis à Sancta Clara proceeds, "pro more," to apply it to the Anglican Confession, quoting the words of the twenty-second Article, on which he says:—

Problema trigesimum septimum et ult. page 273.

"Verba in frontispicio sinè dubio clarissima. Attendendum tamen quod vi hujus articuli non reprehenditur invocatio sanctorum simpliciter seu in se: ut patet: sed *Romana doctrina de Invocatione*, seu de explicatione invocationis sanctorum: sic etiam diserte astruitur: ut etiam patet."

Mr. Newman, in No. 90, having cited the words of the Article, says p. 23:—

"Now the first remark that occurs is, that the doctrine objected to is '*the Romish doctrine.*'"

(2.) *Purgatory, &c.*—F. à Sancta Clara having asserted that the Anglican Confession determines nothing contrary to the truth of faith concerning the invocation of saints, but has exploded as impious the doctrine falsely imputed to the Romish Church, thus expresses himself:—

"Adde quod nemo Nostratium, qui Protestantes habentur, vspiam scripsit contra opinionem Doctoris [Scot.] secundum suam latitudinem, in modo orandi Sanctos, vel postremum modum audiendi orationes nostras.

"Eodem plane modo et eodem verborum tenore, in eodem articulo, abii-
ciunt, non purgatorium, indulgentiam, adorationem imaginum et reliquiarum in se, sed vt prius DOCTRINAM ROMANAM de his omnibus, id est, doctrinam falsò nobis imputatam " (p. 275.)

No. 90, p. 25.

"If, then, the doctrine condemned in this Article concerning purgatory, pardons, images, relics, and saints, be not the Primitive doctrine, nor the Catholic doctrine, nor the Tridentine doctrine, but the Romish *Doctrina Romanensium*, let us next consider what in matter of fact it is."

In the second edition of No. 90, page 25, "Tridentine doctrine" is altered into "Tridentine [statement]." But this does not materially affect the point in discussion. We cannot, however, but express our astonishment that Mr. Newman, after having professed to submit himself to the "expressed judgment" of his diocesan, the Bishop of Oxford, (who declared that that Tract was "objectionable, and may tend to disturb the peace of the Church," and who advised the discontinuance of the so-called "Tracts for the Times, *") should actually publish a *second edition* of the offensive Tract; which second edition is on sale to the present time! Was it (or, is it) candid in Mr. Newman to say (p. 1) that "[the corrections in the second edition are put in brackets]," when, besides the passages professedly corrected, *NEW questions and ADDITIONAL arguments have been introduced?* It has, indeed, been urged in excuse of this conduct, "that the statements of the Tract had been misrepresented, and that it was necessary that it should continue to be circulated, in order that the public might judge of it for themselves.....But if an appeal were to be made to the judgment of the public, the Tract should have been reprinted word for word: whereas the second edition exhibits some important alterations." †

We shall now offer one more striking coincidence between the Franciscan friar and Mr. Newman:—

Expositio Paraphrastica Artic. Confessionis Anglicæ. Art. xxxi. p. 315.

"Totus hic articulus durissimus videtur; rectius tamen introspeciendo, non adeo veritati discordem iudicem.

"Prima pars, quoad affirmatam indubitata est.....In verbis posterioribus, si sobrie intelligantur, nihil agitur contra Sacrificia Missæ in se, sed contra vulgarem vel vulgatam opinionem de ipsis, scilicet quod sacerdotes

No. 90, p. 63.

"On the whole, then, it is conceived that the Article before us neither speaks against the mass in itself, nor against its being an offering‡ for the quick and the dead for the remission of sin; [(especially since the decree of Trent says, that 'the fruits of the bloody oblation are through this most abundantly obtained; so far is the latter from de-

* Newman's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, p. 3.

† Golightly's "Brief Remarks on No. 90," p. 11.

‡ In the second edition we read "[an offering, though commemorative.]"

in sacrificiis offerrent Christum pro vivis et defunctis in remissionem pœnæ et culpæ, adeo vt virtute huius sacrificii ab eis oblatis independenter a crucis sacrificio, merentur populo remissionem, &c. Hæc est vulgata opinio, quam hic perstringit Articulus."

tracting in any way from the former;")]* but against its being viewed, on the one hand, as independent of, or distinct from, the sacrifice on the cross, which is blasphemy; and, on the other, its being directed to the emolument of those to whom it pertains to celebrate it, which is imposture in addition."

2. Next in point of date, after Davenport's attempt to explain away the offensive dogmas of Popery, is Bossuet's celebrated "Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church in matters of Controversy," which was first published in 1671, and was translated into English in 1685. "It had the approving attestation," says Mr. Cunningham, who has derived his facts from Archbishop Wake's preface to his admirable "Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England in the several Articles proposed by Monsieur de Meaux."—(London, 1686. 4to.)

"It had the approving attestation of eleven bishops, and when it was fully printed, and just about to issue from the press, its author sent a copy of it to the Faculty of the Sorbonne, who, instead of approving it, marked for correction not a few passages in which the author, with the view of softening the harsh tenets of Popery, had misrepresented the real doctrines of the Church. Bossuet immediately suppressed this edition, and in a few months published another, in which he availed himself to some extent of the censure of the Sorbonne, although even this he could never prevail upon that learned body to approve. Many Papists disapproved of the book, as an unfaithful statement of Popish doctrine, and as going too far in the way of accommodation of Protestant prejudices. The reigning Pope, Clement X., positively refused to sanction it, though importuned to do so for a period of five years; and it was not till after three years of reiterated importunity that his successor, Pope Innocent XI., was at last prevailed upon, in 1679, to recommend it 'as eminently fitted to promote the Catholic faith on account of its doctrine, method, and *prudence*;' while, on the very same day, his Holiness issued another brief, approving a book which taught a different and opposite doctrine from that of Bossuet and the Gallican Church on the subject of Papal authority. Imbert, a Doctor of Divinity in Bordeaux, was accused of heresy in 1683, and although he proved that his doctrine upon the point was exactly the same as that contained in Bossuet's 'Exposition,' he was condemned and imprisoned for it by his archbishop. Witt, a Popish priest in Mechlin, was also accused of heresy in 1685, and though he supported his opinion by the authority of Bossuet, in his 'Exposition,' yet the Faculty of Louvaine condemned it as scandalous and pernicious.

"Cardinal Capisucchi, master of the sacred palace, and Cardinal

* The sentences printed between brackets have been inserted in the second edition of No. 90.

Bona, whose recommendations of the 'Exposition' are prefixed to the later editions of it, taught, in their own works published about the same time, doctrines on the worship of saints and images, opposed to that of the book which they recommended, and more in accordance with the tenets of the Church of Rome.

"When these facts were published by Wake, Bossuet came forward, and publicly denied the existence of any edition which had been censured by the Sorbonne, and suppressed by himself. Wake providentially had procured a copy of it when he was chaplain to the British ambassador at Paris, and submitted it to the public inspection. Bossuet then asserted that it had been printed without his knowledge; but Wake produced unquestionable evidence that this too was a falsehood. He at the same time convicted Bossuet of two other deliberate lies—one an assertion that he did not know of a book of Father Crasset's, in which his doctrine about the worship of the Virgin Mary was censured, and the other a statement in his pastoral letter to the new converts of his diocese, in which he told them that 'not one of them had suffered violence, either in his person or his goods,' although he knew well that they had been subjected to severe persecution, which he supported both in theory and in practice.* The fact that Bossuet's 'Exposition' was recommended by the Pope, was adduced by the Doctors of the Sorbonne in 1717, as a proof that a diversity of opinion on some points is tolerated in the Church of Rome."†

Wake's exposure of Bossuet's falsehood drew forth a "Vindication," which was translated in 1686, and produced two masterly "Defences" from the pen of Wake.

3. In 1685, the very year in which a Papist ascended the British throne (and it must not be forgotten that the reign of James II. was one continued violation of his coronation oath), John Gother, a Romish missionary priest, published anonymously "A Papist Represented and Misrepresented," in quarto. Following out the plan previously pursued by Davenport and by Bossuet, Gother adroitly endeavours to explain away all that is offensive in Popery, by casting a fallacious and insidious colouring over its peculiar tenets, but with very little regard to truth and honesty. The cause of true religion found a prompt and masterly vindicator in Dr. (afterwards Bishop) Stillingfleet, in his "Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly represented," which treatise was published in 1686, in quarto, and is one of the most unanswerable exposures of Popery and its arts which ever issued from the press. Gother replied in an anonymous pamphlet, entitled "Reflections upon the Answer to the 'Papist Represented and Misrepresented.'" A series of

* The details of this second falsehood are given in M'Gavin's excellent and valuable work, "The Protestant," vol. iii., pp. 202-203, and 206-207.

† J. F. Buddaei *Miscellanea Sacra*, p. ii., pp. 186-187, and 195-196.

answers and rejoinders followed in the years 1686 and 1687, in which Dr. William Sherlock, Mr. A. Seller, Dr. William Claggett, Mr. (afterwards Bishop) John Williams, Dr. John Patrick, Mr. James Taylor, and Dr. (afterwards Bishop) Nicholas Stratford, severally distinguished themselves, and most thoroughly confuted Gother and his anonymous supporters. Gother's treatise has always been a favourite with Romanists; and about sixty years since it was abridged by Richard Challoner, titular Bishop of Debra,* (who had himself been perverted to Popery,) and has passed through numerous editions. The proposed republication of this abridgment, at Edinburgh, suggested to Mr. Cunningham the idea of reprinting Bishop Stillingfleet's unanswerable exposure of Gother's misrepresentations, and his equally unanswerable representation of the true character and principles of Popery. (No. 4.) Besides giving a valuable introduction, Mr. Cunningham has added numerous historical notes, in which he has not only referred those who may be desirous of further information to the best sources, but he has also brought the proofs and illustrations of the doctrines and practices of Popery down to the present time, and has further refuted all that was worth answering in the Edinburgh reprint of Challoner's abridgment of Gother. Altogether, it is a very seasonable and useful publication.

4. In 1704 appeared a small octavo volume, entitled "An Essay towards a Proposal for Catholick Communion: wherein above sixty of the Principal Controverted Points, which have hitherto divided Christendom, being call'd over, 'tis examin'd, how many of them may and ought to be laid aside, and how few remain to be accommodated, for the Effecting a General Peace. By a Minister of the Church of England." The author of this publication was one Cornelius Deane, a papist and a layman,† who, with audacious effrontery and falsehood, states that his attention had been drawn to the subject by "being appointed to preach a visitation sermon"!!! (pp. 1, 2): and he throughout personates a minister of the Church of England, although there is scarcely a page in which his attachment to the Romish

* We may here incidentally notice that the titular Bishop of Debra wilfully omitted, in a popular manual of Romish devotion, the concluding clause of the so-called creed of Pius IV., in which the party making that profession of faith, "promises, vows, and swears," that he will "procure, as far as lies in his power, that the same *shall be held, taught, and preached* by all who are subject to him, or are entrusted to his care by virtue of his office." From Challoner, Mr. Charles Butler copied this mutilated creed, and gave occasion to Dr. Southey to address to him the courteous but severely just strictures, which our readers may find in Dr. Southey's "*Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*," pp. 28-32.

† Dodd's *Certamen Utriusque Ecclesiæ*, p. 16.

communion does not appear. In the prosecution of his fraudulent undertaking, this author disguises Popery, as far as he possibly can, in a Protestant dress, by palliating some parts of it, by denying others, or by asserting that others are not obligatory. In pursuance of this insidious design, after the example of his predecessors in fraud, he has industriously selected numerous insulated passages from English authors, which he could in any way interpret in favour of the tenets of Popery; and thus endeavours to persuade his unsuspecting readers that a member of the Church of England need part with very few, if any, of his principles, in order to be admitted into the Romish Church. The falsehood of this writer's assertions and insinuations, as well as the wickedness of his design, were promptly detected and exposed, as his arguments were refuted, by Mr. Spinckes, the compiler of the well known volume of devotions, by whom "the Essay towards a Proposal for Catholick Communion, &c., lately published by a (pretended) minister of the Church of England," was "printed at large" in 1705, "and answered chapter by chapter: whereby it appears that the author's method of reconciling the Church of England with that of Rome is fallacious, and his design impracticable." Mr. Spinckes's volume is now extremely rare.

The system of misrepresentation adopted in the Popish writings of former days, which we have thus exposed, has been revived in our own times, and prosecuted with equal industry and effrontery.

5. In the year 1826, Dr. Baines, the titular Bishop of Siga, published a sermon on "Faith, Hope, and Charity," which he had delivered at the dedication of a Romish chapel at Bradford, in the county of York. This sermon has recently been widely circulated, in the form of a tract, by a society calling itself the "Catholic Institute." A large issue of this sermon having been made in the parish of Stretton-on-Dunsmore, near Coventry, the exemplary vicar of that parish (whose unwearied efforts in protecting his parishioners from the insidious attacks of Popery, we rejoice to know, have been eminently successful) immediately printed the tract (No. 8) entitled "Faith, Hope, and Charity," in which Dr. Baines's specious and false statements are exposed and refuted in a masterly manner. In order that the titular Bishop of Siga may not have any pretext for complaining of unfair representations, the Vicar of Stretton has printed *verbatim* a copious extract from his sermon relating to the worship and adoration of creatures. Dr. Baines's statements of catholic doctrine are then contrasted (and a thorough contrast they are) with the doctrine of the modern Church of Rome, as embodied

in her Breviary and other books of authorized devotion, quotations from which are given : and the whole is closed by passages of Scripture confirming the representations which Dr. Baines would impose upon unwary readers as the catholic doctrine, and condemning the dogmas of the Romish Church. We select two or three passages, which we think will interest our readers :—

“ The Catholic doctrine, as stated by Dr. Baines, a Bishop of the Church of Rome.

“ The doctrine of the Church of Rome, as contained in the Doway Testament, the Missal, and the Breviary ; the genuine writings of Popes and canonized Saints ; and other devotional exercises of the Church of Rome.

“ THE CATHOLIC CHURCH TEACHES THAT ADORATION MAY NOT BE DONE TO CREATURES.

“ THE CHURCH OF ROME TEACHES THAT ADORATION MAY BE DONE TO CREATURES.

“ ‘ The Catholic Church teaches that it is the worst of treasons, and the greatest of crimes, to give God’s homage TO ANY CREATURE whatsoever.’ (Dr. Baines.)

“ Heb. xi. 21.—Jacob ‘ adored the top of his rod.’

“ ‘ Observe on these words, “ adored the top of his rod,” that adoration (as the Scripture useth this word) MAY BE DONE TO CREATURES, or to God, at and before a creature.’ (Doway New Testament. Note on Heb. xi.)

“ St. Paul gives this description of the wickedness of the heathen world, Rom. i. 25 :—

“ ‘ They changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.’

“ THE CATHOLIC CHURCH TEACHES THAT IT IS WICKED TO GIVE DIVINE HONOUR TO A LIFELESS IMAGE.

“ THE CHURCH OF ROME TEACHES THAT DIVINE HONOUR IS DUE TO A LIFELESS CROSS.

“ ‘ Is it possible that, in an age and country which claims to be so learned and so enlightened, men should be found capable of believing that the majority of the Christian world—the great, the good, the learned of almost every civilized nation under heaven—are so ignorant, so debased, so stupid, so wicked, as to give divine honours to a lifeless and senseless image?’ (Dr. Baines.)

“ ‘ After this (viz., uncovering the cross placed upon the altar) the priest alone carries the cross to a place prepared for it in front of the altar, and, kneeling down, places it there, and takes off his shoes.’ (Roman Missal, Rubric in the Public Service for Good Friday.)

“ ‘ Is it possible that any of you should persuade yourselves that the most ignorant Catholic here present should be capable of adoring, for instance, the ivory image which you see upon that altar?’ (Dr. Baines.)

“ ‘ In the mean time, while the adoration of the cross is going on, (improperia) are recited, and either the whole or a part of the verses following, as the number of those who come to adore may be greater or less. Afterwards all join, “ We

adore thy cross, O Lord, and praise and glorify thy holy resurrection; for, behold, by the wood of the cross cometh joy to the whole world."
(*The same. Roman Missal.*)

" 'They bear him upon the shoulder; they carry him, and set him in his place, and he standeth; from his place shall he not remove: yea, one shall cry unto him, yet can he not answer, nor save him out of his trouble.' (*Isaiah* xlv. 7.)

"When God appeared to Moses at the bush in Horeb, he said unto Moses, 'Draw not nigh hither: *put off thy shoes* from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.' (*Exodus* iii. 5.)

" 'They lavish gold out of the bag and silver in the balance, and hire a goldsmith, and he maketh it a god: they fall down; yea, they worship.' (*Isaiah* xlvi. 6.)

" 'Remember this, and show yourselves men, bring it again to mind, O ye transgressors.' (*Isaiah* xlvi. 8.)

" 'They are altogether brutish and foolish: the stock is a doctrine of vanities.' (*Jeremiah* x. 8.)"

* * * * *

"THE CATHOLIC CHURCH TEACHES THAT NO CREATURE WHATEVER OUGHT TO BE WORSHIPPED.

"THE CHURCH OF ROME TEACHES THAT THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY OUGHT TO BE WORSHIPPED.

" 'We praise thee, the Mother of God; we acknowledge thee to be a Virgin.

" 'Do we not worship and pray to the saints? WE WORSHIP NO CREATURE WHATEVER. (*Dr. Baines.*)

" 'ALL THE EARTH DOTH WORSHIP THEE, THE AUGUST DAUGHTER OF THE ETERNAL FATHER.

" 'Cursed is every goddess worshipper that believes the blessed Virgin Mary to be any more than a creature.' (*Dr. Milner, Letter* 36.)

" 'TO THEE ALL ANGELS AND ARCHANGELS, TO THEE THRONES AND PRINCIPALITIES DO SERVICE. PRAISE BECOMETH THEE, EMPIRE BECOMETH THEE, O MARY: TO THEE BE VIRTUE (OR POWER) AND GLORY FOR EVER AND EVER. AMEN.' (*Daily Tribute of affectionate Prayers and Praises for every Day of the Week to the immaculate Mother of God, Mother of Mercy, and Refuge of Sinners, the Most Holy Mary, drawn from the Works of the Seraphic Doctor Saint Bonaventure, printed at Rome (with licence of the Master of the Apostolic Palace and his deputy), eleventh edition, in 1839, and sold for three halfpence.*)

"*St. John* i. 14.—'The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory (the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth.'

"*Hebrews* i. 5.—'Unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son. And again, when he

bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.'

"*Rev. v. 11.*—'And I beheld and heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders, and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying, with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever. And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four-and-twenty elders fell down and worshipped Him that liveth for ever and ever.'

"*St. Luke iv. 8.*—'Get thee behind me, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and HIM ONLY shalt thou serve.'"

6. "The Declaration of the Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic, and their Coadjutors in Great Britain," appeared in the year 1826. In this remarkable document, which professed to be "an authentic exposition of their real doctrines and practices," nearly all the distinctive articles of their creed, and the practices most notorious in their worship and discipline, were either explained away, or utterly disavowed. But it is especially to be noted that *they carefully avoided ALL reference to the decrees of the so-called Council of Trent, and to the authorized formularies of their Church*; which would instantly have betrayed the fallacy of their assertions. This "Declaration" was reprinted in 1827, and reviewed (we should rather say refuted), "paragraph by paragraph," by the Rev. George Townsend, in a volume replete with historical information, and with references to authentic formularies of Romish devotion, and also to the decrees of the Council of Trent; which decrees are directly opposed to the statements put forth in the "Declaration" of the Romish titular bishops in Great Britain.

7. One of the most compendious among these various attempts to mislead the British nation on the subject of Popery is that made by Viscount Melbourne, in the House of Lords, on the 24th of August, 1835, where he is reported to have said that "*the main opinions of that Church*" (meaning the Romish Church) "*were essentially THE SAME as those of our own.*"* The contrariety of this assertion to the truth is only surpassed by the ignorance which is evinced in it. However, it did not escape detection and exposure. Bishop Mant addressed a letter to the then premier, which he subsequently condensed into a very useful tract, now circulated by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and entitled "The Churches of England

* Barrow's "Mirror of Parliament for 1835," vol. iii., page 2632, col. 1.

and Rome compared, in their declared Doctrines and Practices: wherein is shown the disagreement of the two Churches on many of the fundamental Articles of Christianity." Another useful pamphlet on the same subject was published, in 1836, by the Rev. W. J. Dampier, entitled "The Papist and the Protestant contrasted, in some of their Articles of Faith." But the most recent, as it is the most comprehensive and concise publication we have seen, is the "Short Enquiry into the Doctrines of the Churches of England and of Rome" (No. 7), published, in 1840, by the Loughborough and Ashby-de-la-Zouch Protestant Tract Society;—a Church of England Institution, which has been eminently successful in stemming the progress of Popery in the district within which its labours are confined. We could gladly have transferred the *whole* of this "Enquiry" to our pages, would our limits have permitted it. Rarely have we seen so much documentary information comprised within the small compass of twenty closely printed duodecimo pages, for *twopence*.

8. But the system of denying or explaining away the doctrines of the Romish Church is not confined to the writings or speeches of her avowed advocates. The translations of her authorized formularies of devotion, or of catechetical instruction, which have been published in the English language, equally prove that the integrity of Papists is *not* to be trusted, even when they profess to give accurate versions of them.

(1.) Thus, in "The Roman Missal for the use of the Laity," published by Messrs. Keating and Brown, the accredited Romish booksellers, in Duke-street, Grosvenor-square, in the collect appointed to be said on the 11th of May, the anniversary of *Saint Pius* [V.] "Pope, Conf.," the word "depress" is *falsely* inserted, instead of "crush."

"Deus, qui ad *conterendos* Ecclesiæ tuæ hostes, et ad divinum cultum reparandum, Pium pontificem maximum eligere dignatus es." (*Breviarium Romanum, pars verna*, p. 588 of Husenbeth's edition.)

"O God, who wast pleased to raise blessed Pius to the dignity of chief bishop, in order to *depress* [crush] the enemies of thy Church, and restore the divine worship." (*Roman Missal, &c.*, p. 583.)

Our readers will fully comprehend what is meant by "crushing the enemies of the Church," when we state that this "blessed Pius," besides burning and otherwise putting or causing to be put to death more unhappy persons, who were charged with being heretics, than almost any of his predecessors, not only issued a bull of excommunication and deposition against Queen Elizabeth, but also excited her subjects to rebellion, and supplied some Popish traitors with money to carry on their nefa-

rious designs.* Very saintly virtues these! for which the Romish Church venerates this "blessed" pontiff.

(2.) In page 55 *supra* our readers will find, in a quotation from the bull issued by Leo XII. for the jubilee of 1825, that one of the conditions imposed on Papists, for gaining "*the plenary and complete indulgence, remission, and pardon of ALL THEIR SINS*" thereby granted, was the pouring forth of "pious prayers to God for the exaltation of the holy Church, the **EXTIRPATION OF HERESIES,**" &c. In the "Directions and Instructions, addressed to all the Faithful in the London District, published by the R. R. the Vicars Apostolic" (p. 22), "*the extirpation of heresies*" is softened down into "*bringing back all straying souls to the ways of unity and truth!!!*"

(3.) But the most unblushing instance of wilful perversion of the original document, by altering or suppressing such passages as exhibit the peculiar dogmas of Popery in too open and undisguised a manner, is to be found in "The Catechism of the Council of Trent, published by command of Pope Pius the Fifth, translated into English by the Rev. J. Donovan, Professor, &c., Royal College, Maynooth. Dublin. 1829." 8vo. In his Preface (page xvi.) this "*Professor, &c.,*" modestly expresses his trust that "his fidelity may defy reproof, and on it he rests his only claim to commendation." How little "claim" he has "to commendation" our readers will be enabled to judge for themselves, by the following selection of a few specimens only out of many passages that might be adduced, in which he has wilfully OMITTED, or ADDED TO, or MISTRANSLATED, that celebrated treatise on the dogmas taught and enforced by the modern Church of Rome. We will exhibit these specimens in juxtaposition with the original Latin, assured that a simple inspection of them will convince every ingenuous reader that Mr. Donovan's boasted "fidelity" is *not* to be trusted:—

I. PASSAGES OMITTED TO BE TRANSLATED BY MR. DONOVAN.

* * * *The omissions are printed in italics, between brackets.*

Catechismus Concilii Tridentini.
Parisiis, apud Mequignon Junior-
em, facultatis theologiæ bibliopo-
lam. 1830. 24mo.

Donovan's Translation.

1. Page 124.—"Per sacramenta solum, si eorum forma servetur, peccata remitti possunt, aliter vero nullum jus à peccatis solvendi Ecclesiæ datum est: [*ex quo sequitur, tum sacerdotes, tum sacramenta ad*

1. Page 110.—"Sins can be forgiven only through the sacraments, duly administered. The Church has received no power otherwise to remit sins. [*Whence it follows that both the priests and the sacraments*

* Mendham's "Life and Pontificate of Pius V.," pp. 127-133, 136.

peccata condonanda veluti instrumenta valere: quibus Christus Dominus auctor ipse et largitor salutis remissionem peccatorum et justitiam in notis efficit]."

2. Page 238.—"Nulla gravior alicujus sceleris animadversio à Deo metuenda est, quam si res omnis sanctitatis plena, [*rel potius quæ ipsum sanctitatis auctorem et fontem continet, i. e., or rather, which contains the author and fountain of holiness,*] neque sancte neque religiose à fidelibus tractetur."

3. Page 259.—"Verum alter præterea locus a pastoribus enucleandus est, [*ex quo aperte licet cognoscere, verum Domini corpus et sanguinem in eucharistia contineri, i. e., from which it may be plainly known that the true body and blood of the Lord is contained in the eucharist.*]

4. Page 300.—"Hanc vero dolor et tristitia, quæ perturbatio est et passio a multis vocatur, consequitur veluti comes peccatorum detestationi adjuncta, [*quamobrem apud complures ex sanctis patribus pœnitentiæ definitio hujus modi animi cruciatu declaratur: i. e., wherefore, according to many of the holy fathers, the definition of this kind of penance is declared in the anguish of the soul.*]

5. Page 486.—"Ut ipsi Deo ac sanctis [*qui in cœlis sunt, i. e., who are in heaven*] accommodatissimi sint."

are, as it were, instruments for the pardoning of sins; by which Christ our Lord, the very author and giver of salvation, works in us forgiveness of sins and righteousness]."

2. Page 206.—"For no crime is there reserved by God a more terrible vengeance than for the sacrilegious use of this adorable sacrament" (meaning the eucharist), "which is replete with holiness itself."

3. Page 222.—(*On the corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist*). "The pastor will also produce another passage from Scripture in proof of this sublime truth."

4. Page 254.—"It" (penance as a virtue) "is accompanied with a sincere sorrow, which is an agitation and affection of the mind, and is called by many a passion; and, if accompanied with detestation, is, as it were, the companion of sin."

5. Page 389.—"Most pleasing in the sight of God, and of his saints."

II. PASSAGES ADDED BY MR. DONOVAN.

* * * *The additions are printed in italics, between brackets.*

6. Page 107.—"Non negandum tamen, quin in Ecclesiæ potestate sint ut qui ab ea in judicium vocentur, puniantur [*i. e., be punished*] et anathemate damnentur," [*damned with an anathema*].

7. Page 306.—"Quod quidem non minus vere de illo etiam homine sacerdos pronunciat, qui prius ardentissimæ contritionis vi,

6. Page 96.—"It is not, however, to be denied that they" (*i. e., heretics and schismatics*) "are still subject to the jurisdiction of the Church, inasmuch as they are liable to have judgment passed on their opinions, to be visited with [*spiritual*] punishments, and denounced with anathema."

7. Page 259.—(*On the form of absolution*). "This form is not less true when pronounced by the priest over him, who by means of perfect contrition has already ob-

accedente tamen confessionis voto, peccatorum veniam a Deo consecutus est."

tained the pardon of his sins. [*Perfect contrition, it is true, reconciles the sinner to God; but his justification is not to be ascribed to perfect contrition alone*], independently of the desire which it includes of receiving the sacrament of penance."

III. PASSAGES MISTRANSLATED BY MR. DONOVAN.

* * * *The mistranslations are printed in italics, between brackets.*

8. Page 73.—"Patres primæ Constantinopolitanæ Synodi huic loco addiderunt *secundum Scripturas*. Quod quidem ab apostolo acceptum in fidei symbolum.....transtulerunt."

8. Page 64.—"Here the fathers of the first Council of Constantinople added the words 'according to the Scriptures,' which they received from [*apostolical tradition*], and embodied with the creed."

9. Page 259.—"Quæ quidem verba" (1 Cor. x. 16) "verum corporis et sanguinis Christi Domini substantiam demonstrant."

9. Page 226.—"Words which prove to demonstration [*the real presence*] of [*Jesus*] Christ [*in the holy sacrament of the eucharist*]."

10. Page 488.—"Danda enim opera est, ne quid prætermittant, quod vel ad peccatorum confessionem attinet, vel ad reliqua sacramenta, quæ a Christianis hominibus percipi debent, cum mors appropinquat."

10. Page 390.—"[*We should then*" [*i. e., when parents are dangerously ill*] "*pay particular attention to what regards their eternal salvation, taking especial care that they duly receive the last sacraments.*"]

11. Page 488.—"Religionis præsidio muniti."

11. Page 390.—"Fortified by the [*sacraments of the Church*]."

12. Page 493.—"De iis vero qui sacerdotibus non obtemperant scriptum est," &c.

12. Page 394.—"But of those who resist the [*spiritual authority of the*] priest it is written," &c.

Many other passages might be offered; but the preceding will be more than sufficient to convince every candid enquirer that no confidence whatever can be reposed in the translations, by Papists, of the authentic documents of the Romish Church, however loudly the authors of them may assert their fidelity.

(4.) But the practice, on the part of the Romanists, of giving false and insidious representations of the tenets of their Church, is not confined to Great Britain and Ireland. It has been pursued, with equal reckless disregard of truth, in the United States of America, where Popery has of late years been advancing with such strides as to excite very serious apprehensions in the minds of the friends of "pure and undefiled religion."*

* That the apprehensions of the Americans are not without foundation has been fully proved [by Mr. S. B. Morse] in "Foreign Conspiracy Against the Liberties of the United States." New York and Boston. 1835. 18mo. While this sheet was in the press, we read in a foreign journal the fact that an American citizen, a Dr. Remi, the Popish Bishop of Detroit, had been thrown into the prison of the *holy inquisition*, at Rome, for refusing to resign his bishopric; the affair was submitted to the consideration of the American Congress,

The defenders of the Protestant faith against the attacks of the Papists having published, in the New York "Protestant," a series of extracts from the Anglo-Romish translation of the New Testament, printed at Rheims, in the year 1582; the authenticity of these extracts was *immediately* denied by the Papists, as it was disbelieved by very many Protestants, simply because the common editions of the Anglo-Romish version of the Scriptures contain very few of the notes of the original edition. In order to refute the false assertions of the North American Papists, some gentlemen at New York raised funds, by subscription, and caused the Rhemish Testament of 1582 to be accurately stereotyped, *entire*, in a closely printed octavo volume, which was published in 1834, with an Introductory Essay, from which we have derived the preceding particulars.

Having, in our last number (pp. 469-480), offered some strictures on the *first* edition of Mr. Newman's Tract, No. 90, and on Dr. Pusey's Letter to Dr. Jelf, we need not now introduce any additional observations on the relaxing system of interpretation, which, in common with the Franciscan friar Davenport, *alias* Franciscus à Sancta Clara, the Oxford Tractarians are endeavouring to uphold. But we do earnestly entreat all who are interested in the important question now at issue *attentively* to peruse the Rev. Dr. Miller's temperate and well written "Second Letter" to the Rev. Dr. Pusey (No. 6). That it will be perused by the latter, we can scarcely doubt. Sincerely do we wish that he would listen to Dr. Miller's friendly counsel, and would "consider most seriously, in its whole extent, the system of teaching which he has undertaken to advocate..... not seeing very clearly the result to which it tends." (*Miller's Second Letter*, p. 83.)

In a recent instance that "result" has been the going over to the papal camp of one (the Rev. R. W. Sibthorp,)* who for many years sustained the character of a devout and eloquent clergyman of the Church of England, on whose discourses listening congregations hung with profound and breathless attention.

on the 18th of July, 1841, and it was expected that the President would have recourse to severe measures with Pope Gregory XVI. for this violation of the law of nations in imprisoning an American citizen. (*Archives du Christianisme*, Nov. 27th, 1841, page 175.)

* While this sheet was passing through the press, it was announced in the *St. James's Chronicle*, of Saturday, December 4th, 1841, that the Rev. F. D. Wackerbarth (who had for some time been suspended from performing any ecclesiastical function) had followed the example of Mr. Sibthorp, and had embraced the Romish faith. Those who have read his "*Tvba Concordiæ*," dated "Lichfield, Feast of St. Raymund, c10.10.ccc.xli. [that is, January 23rd, 1841], will not be surprised at this step. The only surprise is, that he did not honourably take it immediately on the publication of his pamphlet.

His early predilections were in favour of Rome ; but subsequent examination convinced him of the errors of Popery. After his ordination, as a clergyman of the Church of England, it is well known that he adopted very low views of ecclesiastical discipline, though latterly he proceeded to the opposite extreme ; deriving his views of the Christian religion more from the fathers than from the holy Scriptures, and exalting the Church to the Saviour's place, while undue attention was given to ceremonial observances. Tractarianism was his stepping-stone to Popery. We much doubt, however, whether he has not found the haven towards which he was for sometime approaching to be a very muddy one. But it must not be forgotten that in his *maturer years*, Mr. Sibthorp appeared from the press as the able antagonist of Popery. Two discourses, delivered by him, and published respectively in 1827 and 1828, are now before us ; one, on "The Character and Tokens of the true Catholic Church ;" the other, on "The Character of the Papacy, as predicted by St. Paul in 2 Thess. ii. 4." In the first of these discourses he examines the four marks which the Romish Church arrogates exclusively to itself, viz., unity, sanctity, universality, and apostolicity ; and he shows, with much clearness of argument and force of evidence, that every one of these marks is utterly inapplicable to Rome, and totally destitute of foundation. We are tempted to offer two or three extracts.

Speaking of UNITY, he says :—

"A careful and impartial examiner of the writings of the earliest fathers will be surprised to find, how little bearing on this subject even the avowed advocates of the Church of Rome are able to extract from them, with all their confident pretensions. These excellent men exhort much to unity, and enlarge upon it ; BUT IT IS A UNITY IN CHRIST, NOT IN THE POPE ; a unity in the true Catholic Church, as we Protestants explain that term, NOT IN THE SEE OF ROME ; further than as that see, from the rank it derived from the capital of the Roman empire, is sometimes adverted to very naturally as a leading portion of the Church Universal." (p. 19.)

On the subject of the PRETENDED UNIVERSALITY of the Romish Church, Mr. Sibthorp thus expresses himself :—

"Romanists make the universality of the Church to consist also *in teaching all nations, and in maintaining all truths*. I have shown that the latter has marked the true Church, in the sense in which we Protestants explain that term, at all periods. I wish it were as easy to show that the Church of Rome maintained nothing but the truth, and that in the additions she has made to the pure confessions of faith of the first four centuries, she had not, not only obscured, but undermined that truth : nay, in some points, denied it. By requiring these additions to be received at the peril of damnation, she runs the risk of excluding her members from the true Catholic Church, and greatly endangers their salvation. We cannot limit the mercy of God, nor say what allowances

he may be pleased to make for ignorance, misapprehension, prejudices, or force of education ; but we do fear much for those who, with scriptural light around and before them, cling with tenacity to errors subversive of the truth as it is in Jesus. And most solemnly and affectionately do I exhort my Roman Catholic brethren to search for themselves the holy Scriptures, with earnest prayer to God, to show them the truth, and deliver them from all error. Never have there been wanting faithful men who have held and believed all those truths which the apostles believed and taught, and which all true Protestants now hold and teach ; and this is all that is necessary to constitute the Church's universality, as it respects the maintaining all truth. If to teach all nations be a proof of the Church's universality, the Roman Church cannot, in the present day, put in any exclusive claim to be considered the Church of Christ. There are not many known parts of the earth where Protestants have not missions, and these more or less successful to the conversion of pagans and idolators. The inhabitants of Greenland and of the South Sea Islands, numbers of the Esquimaux and of the Hottentots, and many both in the East and West Indies have been converted to the Christian faith, within the last seventy years, by the blessing of God on the zealous labours of Protestants. Whereas the missions of the Church of Rome are now comparatively few, feeble, and inefficient. And the Jews are also the objects of the charitable zeal of the Protestant Churches. So that it may be satisfactorily proved, that, while we hold universality to be a token of the Church of Christ, we have no reason to look to the Church of Rome to find this or any other points wherein it consists, but may, *without any reference to her*, justly and truly say, that we believe in one holy *Catholic* Church. And this Church, we confidently believe, shall finally be extended through all the earth." (pp. 46-48.)

CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH OF ROME:—

"The Church of Rome, so far from being one and the same as the Catholic Church of Christ, is an opponent thereof ; and has, by her doctrines, her practices, and her spirit, kept many back from coming into the fold of Christ who would have entered : inasmuch as those doctrines are subversive of the Gospel, those practices evil and dangerous deceptions, and that spirit secular, domineering, and intolerant." (p. 61.)

In the discourse on 2 Thess. ii. 4, Mr. Sibthorp fixes upon Rome "the seat, residence, and local position" of "the extraordinary and antichristian power" predicted by St. Paul ; and then exposes and refutes "the claims or assumptions" of the Papacy, in arrogating to the Roman pontiffs infallibility and the titles of deity, together with the doctrine of supererogation, and the practice of indulgences as connected with it. In conclusion, he considers "some of the acts or measures by which the Papacy maintains the claim or assumption already noticed :"—viz., "the Popes, in virtue of their assumed authority and supremacy, dispensing with the laws of God, as revealed in his written word ;" their "adding to the written law of God, which is another invasion of the divine prerogative ;" "withholding the Scriptures from the mass of the people ;" and their pretending to enrol dead sinful mortals among the blessed saints in heaven, by ca-

nonizing them. Many passages occur in this discourse which demonstrate that the writer of them could be no papist. We have room only for one or two.

On the DUTY OF GRATITUDE *for the blessings of the Reformation*, Mr. Sibthorp thus expresses himself:—

“If the Papacy answers to the description of the text, then is it that power spoken of by the apostle in the whole passage of which the text forms a part.....And if this be so, then, brethren, are we bound to give hearty thanks, that from the dominion and delusions of the Papacy the Lord has set us free. Our feeling of this great mercy has become blunted by the continuance of it, as dangers distant and long past are wont to be forgotten. But the favour of the deliverance is not lessened by being remote. *If we value the love of God, the attainment of heaven, and our own immortal souls, we should make it a frequent matter of thanksgiving that we are NOT members of the Church of Rome.* And that this our land is not one of those that give their strength unto the beast, ought often to excite our hearty praise to Him, who orders all things both in heaven and in earth; that she enjoys, widely diffused throughout her borders, the heavenly wisdom of the word of God—his soul-reviving precepts, comforting promises, holy doctrines, salutary admonitions; that the ordinances of a pure worship are found in her; and that the genuine influence of the blessed Gospel is not restrained, nor its truths adulterated by the intervention of a foreign ecclesiastical authority; is a blessing for which we cannot be sufficiently grateful to our God. May these mercies not be lost upon us! May we be carefully diligent that they may become not, like all abused privileges, a cause of heavier condemnation! for to whomsoever much is given, of them will much be required. May the word of the Lord have free course in our hearts, as well as in our land; and be glorified by the obedience of our wills, and by the allegiance of our affections to all its instructions!” (pp. 20, 21.)

“It would be a false charity to conceal the truth. The Papacy is the enemy of God, his cause, and people; and it is to be destroyed with signal marks of his wrath. The warning voice of the Apocalypse proclaims—*Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not her plagues.*” (p. 22.)

“That the curse of God rests on the Papacy may not be doubted, seeing it is so clearly denounced in his word. And the danger as to *eternity* is proportionate to the means of safety and escape granted in *time*. UNQUESTIONABLY GREAT, THEN, AND IMMINENT IS THE DANGER OF THOSE, WHO, in an age of scriptural light and religious knowledge, LIVE AND DIE IN SUBJECTION TO A POWER WHICH GOD HAS DECLARED HE WILL JUDGE, and visit with his wrath, even unto utter destruction.” (p. 23.)

Would that these his own impressive sentences had been present to the writer’s mind before he renounced spiritual liberty in order to embrace spiritual bondage! For ourselves, we would indulge the hope, that he has received too much light to remain satisfied with Romish novelties; and that after many pangs for the step he has taken, Mr. Sibthorp will return to our scriptural fold, no more to be “tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive.” (Eph. iv. 14.) At all

events, while the enemies of the Church are triumphing in his apostasy, her friends, we doubt not, will fervently beseech that "merciful God who willeth not the death of a sinner, but would rather that he should be converted and live," to grant him "repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." (2 Tim. ii. 25.)

The perversion of this gentleman to Popery shows the downward tendency of the principles of the Tractarians: nor can we see how any one who adopts the whole of those principles, with their necessary consequences, can stop short of becoming a Papist. This is the opinion of the shrewd editor of the *Tablet* (the weekly organ of the Papists in England); who, speaking of Mr. Newman's writings says: "*His recent publications convince us that he has, unconsciously, APPROACHED MUCH NEARER TO CATHOLICISM THAN HE CHOOSES TO ACKNOWLEDGE; and that he is now painfully casting about for obstacles to any further progress in this direction.*"* This opinion of the Romanist is confirmed by the fact stated by the Rev. C. P. Golightly, in his letter to the Editor of that sound and firm Protestant and Church of England newspaper, the *Standard*, dated Nov. 21st, 1841, viz., "that Mr. Ward (a Tractarian), fellow of Balliol College, and an intimate friend of Mr. Newman, in the course of the present month" [November, 1841], "told a friend of Mr. Golightly's, opposed to him in opinions, and *not* in confidential conversation, that A CERTAIN PARTY in this place" [the University of Oxford] "*might now be considered to be divided into disciples of Mr. NEWMAN, and disciples of Dr. Pusey; the latter OPPOSED, the former NO LONGER OPPOSED TO ROME.*"†

If any further evidence were wanting to demonstrate the downward tendency of Tractarianism towards Rome, it is sufficiently supplied by the astounding fact which the Rev. Baden Powell,‡ Savilian Professor of Astronomy, in the University of Oxford, has publicly announced from the pulpit, before the Mayor and Corporation of Oxford, and subsequently published, without any, the slightest, effort on the part of the Tractarians to contradict, deny, or disprove his statement; viz., that in that University "*attempts have been made* BY MINISTERS OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH TO ENFORCE ON *those who are under their influence*" THE PRACTICE OF AURICULAR CONFESSION—one of the most monstrous, and at the same time most efficacious artifices, which Popery has contrived "for maintaining the iron despotism, with

* The *Tablet*, cited by the Rev. W. S. Bricknell, in his pamphlet entitled "Resignation; or, Lay Communion." (p. 7, note.)

† *Standard* newspaper of Nov. 29.

‡ See pages 17 and 18 of "The Protestant's Warning and Safeguard: a Sermon." Oxford and London. 1841. 8vo.

which she rules the consciences of men." "Such facts," Mr. Powell remarks, "speak for themselves, and must open the eyes of the most incredulous or indifferent."

Mr. Sibthorp's perversion to Popery has, of course, been hailed with the highest exultation by the Romanists; and one of their most zealous organs (the *Limerick Reporter*) has asserted that the Popish "Colleges in Lancashire, Cheshire, and Staffordshire, contain many Protestants undergoing probation, previous to their reception into the bosom of the Catholic" [Romish] "Church; and the greater number of these are *clergymen ordained according to the Protestant formula*."* We cannot but suspect that there is some exaggeration in this assertion of the Irish journalist; but it demands diligent investigation, especially when the facts just stated by Mr. Golightly and Professor Powell are taken into consideration.

The Tractarians have now brought on a crisis in the history of their school. The attempts to introduce auricular confession, charged upon them by the Savilian Professor, cannot pass without judicial enquiry before the proper university or ecclesiastical authorities. May their decision be pronounced in the fear of God, and be overruled for the welfare of the Church, and the triumph of "truth without any mixture of error!"

The tendency of these divines towards Rome has not escaped the observation of the acute titular Bishop of Melipotamus. In his "Letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury" (No. 5), Dr. Wiseman says that "it seems to him *impossible to read the works of the Oxford divines*, and especially to follow them chronologically, *without discovering A DAILY APPROACH TOWARDS OUR HOLY CHURCH*," [meaning the Romish Church, with all her unscriptural and antisciptural tenets and practices] "BOTH IN DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE." (p. 13.)

In order to accomplish the re-union of the Churches of England and of Rome, Dr. Wiseman recommends the explaining away system of interpretation. "*We must* (he says) *explain to the utmost*; we must compare some parts of the system with others; we must press for the most favourable construction; we must judge of meanings by actions and by feelings." (p. 31.) Historical experience, however, is against any such union, as Dr. Miller has shown, by a statement of facts, in pages 93-96 of his Letter to Dr. Pusey. Indeed, it appears from a passage in Dr. Wiseman's Letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury (p. 30), that his attempts "to explain or defend certain phrases employed in popular" [Romish] "devotions" has "exposed him to cen-

* See the *St. James's Chronicle*, Dec. 4th, 1841, p. 2.

sure." And how does Dr. Wiseman justify his explaining away the objectionable "phrases?" BY APPEALING TO THE RELAXING SYSTEM OF INTERPRETATION ADOPTED BY THE OXFORD TRACTARIANS, ESPECIALLY THE AUTHOR OF No. 90!!! "As to expressions (he says), surely they" [meaning the Tractarians] "who openly adopt the principle, that in interpreting their Articles they are bound, in the first place, to do so in accordance with Catholic doctrine, and, in the second, to *do almost any violence to the words to effect this agreement*, cannot refuse us the right to bring all our formularies of devotion into harmony with our formularies of belief." (p. 30.) "The way (he subsequently asserts) is in part prepared by the demonstration that such interpretation may be given of the most difficult Articles, as will strip them of all contradiction to the decrees of the Tridentine synod." (p. 38.) Dr. Wiseman further considers the plan pursued in the Tract No. 90, "and in which Mr. Warde, Mr. Oakley, and even Dr. Pusey, have agreed," viz., "the method of bringing their doctrines into accordance" with those of the Romish Church, "by explanation" (p. 38), as "a promising circumstance" among the facilities, in the present state of things, "for bringing about so happy a consummation as the re-union of England to the Catholic" [Romish] "Church." (p. 35.) "Experience (he affirms) has now shown that the country population are ready to receive, without murmuring, indeed with pleasure, the Catholic" [Romish] "views propounded from Oxford; and, indeed, even more, when taught through regular parochial instruction." (p. 40.) How the Tractarians will digest these identifications of their relaxing system of interpretation with Popery we know not. "The wish," however, "was father to the thought" when the titular Bishop of Melipotamus penned this sentence. But, without designing it, he has disclosed a most gratifying truth; for never, perhaps, were, not merely "the country population," but the members of the Church of England generally, more sincerely attached to their clergy, or more willing to be "taught through regular parochial instruction." The "ministers of our Church, (it has been observed with equal truth and beauty by our venerable primate) *can NEVER forget* that they are the messengers of the Lord to his people; the shepherds of his flock, to guide and feed them; the stewards of his household, to dispense to their fellow-servants the bread of life." (*Charge*, p. 37.) And so long as the clergy, in fulfilment of their ordination vow, continue to be "*ready, with ALL faithful diligence to BANISH AND DRIVE AWAY ALL ERRONEOUS AND STRANGE doctrines*" (whether Romish or others) *contrary to God's word*; so long, with the divine blessing upon their unwea-

med labours, it will be impossible for the advocates of Popery, or of approximations to Popery, to make any real progress, however they may dream of unprotestantizing the land, while they revile the memories of our martyred reformers; especially as the living fathers of our Church, the bishops—mindful of the solemn obligations into which they entered at their consecration to the episcopate—are fully alive to the ceaseless efforts of Romanists in propagating their system: and several of them have nobly lifted up a warning voice against the tendency towards Rome of the publications of the Tractarians in their recent Charges (Nos. 9 to 16), portions of which are so appropriate, that, we feel assured, we shall confer a favour upon our readers by laying before them the sentiments of these Prelates upon certain topics which are advocated by the Tractarians. As the Charges in question have been published at the request of the clergy to whom they were severally delivered, any commendation of ours is unnecessary; but we may be permitted to add, that the Charges of his Grace the Archbishop of CANTERBURY, and of the Bishops of WINCHESTER, LINCOLN, CHESTER, EXETER, GLOUCESTER and BRISTOL, and of RIPON, are especially worthy of attentive perusal by all who take a deep interest in the welfare of our Church.

1. Introduction of Novelties.

The Archbishop of CANTERBURY says:—

“In the celebration of divine service the introduction of novelties is much to be deprecated; and even the revival of obsolete usages, which, having grown obsolete, have the appearance of novelties to the ignorant, may occasion dissatisfaction, dissension, and controversy. In cases of this nature it may be better to forego even advantageous changes, and wait for the decision of authority, than to open fresh sources of misapprehension or strife by singularity.” (*Charge*, p. 36.)

2. The Principles of the Tractarians exposed.

The Bishop of DURHAM:—

“If these writers *did* feel themselves called upon to examine the existing state of doctrine, in the hope of improving it, the result of their efforts has assuredly been very unfortunate. So far from adding to the purity of our faith, as contrasted with those errors from which we believed that the Reformation had set us free, the tendency appears to have been in an opposite direction. The effect of principles, either expressly laid down by these writers, or collected as a natural inference by their followers, has been not merely to recommend a variety of antiquated forms and ceremonies, but to uphold them with such earnestness as to threaten a revival of the follies of by-gone superstition. The necessity of fasting is inculcated, and its merit enhanced, too eagerly; the placing of candlesticks is now treated as matter of importance; and a suspicious predilection has been manifested for the emblem of the cross. While contempt is somewhat ostentatiously thrown upon the

name of Protestant and the proceedings of our venerable Reformers, an elaborate attempt has been made to explain away the real meaning of our Articles, and infuse into them a more kindly spirit of accommodation to the opinions and practices of the Church of Rome." (*Charge*, pp. 11, 12.)

In a note his lordship adds—

"From these appearances an acute critic has been led to make the following pungent observation: 'For our own parts, we are not going to discuss whose religion is the better—that of Protestants or Catholics. But one thing, at least, is quite certain: the above opinions may be right—they may be the most consonant with revealed religion—but assuredly they are not the opinions of the Church of England.' (*Edinburgh Review*, April, 1841, p. 273)."

The Bishop of CHESTER:—

"The divinity of the Oxford Tracts has been as *completely refuted*, in all its parts, as any erroneous opinions can ever be refuted; and it is a sign of the discretion, if not of the candour of the writers, to treat these answers generally as if they had never been written." (*Charge*, p. 20, note.)

3. *Wilful departure from a Protestant Author, whom they profess to follow.*

The Bishop of EXETER:—

"Defending themselves against the charge of leaning towards Popery, they confidently affirm, that 'in the seventeenth century the theology of the body of the English Church was substantially the same as theirs;'^{*} and in proof of this they profess, in stating the errors of Rome, to 'follow closely the order observed by Bishop Hall, in his treatise on "The Old Religion,"' whose Protestantism, they add, 'is unquestionable,' and is claimed, therefore, as a voucher for their own. But, looking to particulars, I lament to see them 'following, indeed, the *order* of Bishop Hall,' but widely departing from his truly Protestant sentiments on more than one important Article.

"First, of 'THE WORSHIP OF IMAGES,' (for so that great divine † justly designates what they *more delicately* call 'the honour paid to images') they say only that it is 'dangerous in the case of the uneducated; that is, of the great part of Christians.' ‡ But Bishop Hall treats it as not merely 'dangerous' to some, but as sinful in all: as 'against Scripture'—'the book of God is full of indignation against this practice;' and 'against reason.' 'What a madness is it (says he) for a living man to stoop unto a dead stock!'

"Next, of 'THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS,' these writers say that it 'is a dangerous practice, as tending to give, often actually giving, to creatures the honour and reliance due to the Creator alone.' (p. 12.)

"But how does the good bishop, whom they profess to follow, speak on this same point? '*These foul superstitions* (says he) are not more *heinous* than new, and such as wherein we have justly *abhorred* to take part with the practisers of them.' Again: 'This doctrine and practice of the Romish invocation of saints, both as new and erroneous, against

* "Tracts for the Times," No. 38, p. 11.

† Bishop Hall's Works, 8vo., vol. ix., p. 340.

‡ Ibid., pp. 365, 368.

Scripture and reason, we have justly rejected ; and are thereupon ejected, as unjustly.' ” (*Charge*, pp. 77, 78.)

4. Sufficiency of Scripture, and against unauthorized Human Traditions.

The Bishop of GLOUCESTER :—

“ These writers speak of Scripture and Tradition as the two channels in which the Christian revelation has been communicated. That they mean thereby to elevate Tradition into the same rank with the written word of God, I will not believe ; but the vulgar and unlearned may and will be induced to suppose that such is their intention : and hence a fatal delusion may ensue, tending to recall the various errors and abuses of Romanism. Respecting the sufficiency of Scripture, our sixth Article of Religion is so distinct and explicit, declaring that it contains all things necessary for salvation, and requiring nothing to be believed as an article of the faith but what is contained therein, or can be proved thereby, that upon this head there hardly seems to be any room for controversy among ourselves. And, in regard to points of discipline, our Church has endeavoured to preserve a similar rule, adopting the practices of the earliest period which the records of Christian antiquity have preserved ; but still, even in these cases, appealing for their confirmation or justification to the Scriptures. Thus are the institution of infant baptism and the observance of the Lord’s day enjoined, not merely on the authority of Tradition, however ancient and undoubted, but because, though not commanded in Scripture, they have the warranty of scriptural authority, inasmuch as they may fairly be inferred from what is actually written. To recount the evils which would flow from a large admission of traditional authority, the present occasion would not permit. But this main distinction is never to be lost sight of—what is found in the inspired Scriptures has come to us with the warranty of Heaven : what is handed down through other sources of primitive belief rests, after all, upon the authority of man, exposed to the errors, distortions, and corruptions arising from the ignorance, superstition, or presumption of our nature, from which the early ages of Christianity were not exempt. Those, therefore, who would receive Tradition as a part of revelation, must appeal to something more than earthly sagacity and judgment to separate truth from error ; and they will find themselves driven to the necessity of investing some human authority with the divine attribute of infallibility—that very assumption of the Romish Church from which so many of its corruptions have been derived.” (*Charge*, pp. 34, 35.)

The Bishop of WINCHESTER :—

“ There is ground again for fear, if we are in peril of losing sight of the opinion of Bishop Hall, that the chief ground of all the errors of the Church of Rome is the over-valuing of Tradition ; or of the cautious warning of Bishop Jewel, that we may in nowise believe the Churches themselves, unless they say such things as are agreeable to the Scriptures ;—if we derogate from the exclusive supremacy of the word, as containing all things necessary to salvation, by a phraseology which, in effect, gives a co-ordinate authority to the interpretation of antiquity, instead of making the Church, with our Article, ‘ a witness and a keeper of holy writ ;’—or if, finally, instead of taking holy Scripture, with Bishop Taylor, as ‘ a full and sufficient rule to Christians,

..... because there is no other,' * we distinguish 'two instruments of Christian teaching—holy Scripture and the Church ;' and after adjusting their respective offices, so as to establish, not an exclusive, but a combined or joint rule of faith, conclude that, in the sense in which the phrase 'is commonly understood at this day, Scripture, it is plain, is *not*, on Anglican principles, the rule of faith.' What is this, but to imply, in spirit, if not in terms, a double revelation?"† (*Charge*, p. 34.)

The Bishop of DURHAM :—

"They, who have shown such anxiety to improve the state of religious feeling in this our Church, would have done well to recollect, when they began to defer with such implicit reverence to the authority of the fathers, and endeavoured to trace the true meaning of revelation through the medium of Tradition, that, before the fathers wrote, or any matter of opinion or of fact could be conveyed through those who succeeded them, there existed the infallible word of God, dictated by his Holy Spirit, and preserved for our study and edification by the special care of his good providence. To this one only mean of truth and source of faith they should have directed their unremitting attention. In the interpretation of dark passages, and the explanation of essential doctrines, their learning, diligence, and acuteness would have found ample scope, and might have done good service to the cause of sacred truth. In such labours their researches into antiquity, and their acquaintance with the writings of the fathers, might have been useful ; although I am of opinion that the aid which may be derived from such sources towards the elucidation of holy writ has been rated too highly. A thorough knowledge of the original languages (of one of which—that in which the Old Testament is written—the fathers, be it remembered, were almost all ignorant), a study of the works of the best critical expounders, with a careful weighing of different opinions and arguments, will, by God's help implored in fervent but humble supplication, lead the mind to a clearer perception of the truth as it is in Jesus than all the writings of the fathers ; and will also put in a striking point of view the little dependence that can be placed on the fallacies or sophistries of Tradition. 'Let us reverently hear and read holy Scripture, which is the food of the soul,' is the exhortation of the first of our Homilies ; and justly does it call for our compliance as it proceeds, though in the quaint language of the times : 'Let us diligently search for the well of life in the books of the New and Old Testament, and not run to the stinking puddle of men's traditions (devised by men's imaginations) for our justification and salvation. For in holy Scripture is fully contained what we ought to do, and what to eschew, what to believe, what to love, and what to look for at God's hands at length.' " (*Charge*, pp. 13-15.)

5. *Against Tractarian Representations of the Church as the Author of Salvation, instead of the Channel through which Salvation flows.*

The Bishop of CHESTER :—

"The other error is no less injurious to the Saviour's glory.

* Second part of "The Dissuasive from Popery," sect. ii., Works, vol. x., p. 384. See also "The Rule of Conscience," book ii., chap. iii., rule xiv. "That the Scriptures are not a perfect rule of faith and manners, but that Tradition is to be added to make it a full repository of the divine will, is affirmed by the Church of Rome." (Works, vol. xiii., p. 97.) † Tract 90, pp. 5, 7, 11.

Practically he is treated with dishonour, when the Church which he has established is made to usurp his place, to perform his acts, to receive his homage—is so represented as to be virtually the author of salvation, instead of the channel through which salvation flows. This is, in truth, to depose him from his throne, and to invest his subjects with the authority which belongs to himself alone.

“It is convenient, no doubt, in language, to embody the multitude who believe in Christ under one comprehensive term: and our Lord has himself taught us, by example, that we may do this safely and legitimately. But language may mislead. We may personify a body for the convenience of discourse, and by degrees forget that a community is not a person. And it is still worse, if the body, which was first personified, comes afterwards to be deified. Yet a process of this kind has gone on with regard to the Christian Church. When Jesus declared that he would build his Church upon a rock, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it, he simply declared that there should hereafter ever be a body of men believing in him as the Son of God—a body which Satan might assail, but should never succeed in destroying. He did not say that he would set up a power upon earth which should possess his authority, act in his stead, and as his vicegerent dispense his anger or his favour. We look in vain for a single sentence in which such a purpose is implied—a purpose so important, and, I may add, so extraordinary, that it must have been written in words which none could fail to read. But advantage has been taken of the obscurity of language to maintain and encourage this idea. The Church has been made, first an abstraction, and then a person, and then a Saviour. The Church, thus invested with divinity, has the minister as her visible representative; and he, explaining the prophetic anticipation, has assumed the place of God. We too well know what corruptions found entrance at this source—what opportunity was given to the exercise of the worst of human passions—what food was supplied to malice, enmity, pride, covetousness, and ambition. So that one of the first and most needful works of the Reformers was to pierce the veil, to divest the Church of the mystery in which it had been shrouded, and to disclose it to the world in its true and scriptural form, as the company of believers.* The Church is that body which had assembled in the upper chamber at Jerusalem, and there received the promise of their risen and ascended Lord. The Church is that party which united together, and ‘had all things common,’ and ‘continued in the apostles’ fellowship.’ The Church is that ‘congregation of faithful men,’ in all ages and of all countries, who maintain in their purity the doctrines and institutions of the Gospel. The ministers of this Church are those called to serve the united body—to perform the prescribed rites—to teach, to rebuke, to exhort, to warn, to comfort—and to commit perpetually to other faithful men the things which they have themselves received.

“Such is the simple analysis of the Church—the Holy Catholic Church, of which Christ is the head, and with which he has engaged to be present by his Spirit unto the end of the world. We must beware of assigning to the members, or to the body which the members compose, a power which really belongs to the Head alone. If we speak of the

* Art. xix. “The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered according to Christ’s ordinance.”

ark of Christ's Church, we must remember that we are only speaking metaphorically. That ark is not limited to any special locality on earth, like the ark of Noah : it extends as far as the knowledge of Christ extends ; for he is the true ark, prepared of God for the saving of all who commit themselves to him. The ministrations of the Church are the door by which the community of the faithful on earth is entered : but Christ is the only door by which heaven can be entered ; and many may be admitted into the visible fold who remain for ever unknown to the true Shepherd. The members of the Church are branches of the vine ; but the Church is not the vine : that name belongs to Christ alone. The Church is 'the pillar and ground of the truth ;' but the Church is not 'the truth,' neither has it life in itself : Christ alone is 'the way, the truth, and the life,' through which every individual member of the Church must seek access to God.

" Yet all this, undeniable itself, is practically contradicted, whenever the services, and the ordinances, and the ministerial office are magnified beyond their due proportions, or placed before the people with a prominence to which they have no claim. Church principles, in their proper sense, all must approve. All must approve of that cordial agreement with the articles, that sincere preference of the services, that willing conformity to the discipline of the Church, which show that our profession is honest and consistent. This, and nothing else, must be the meaning of the phrase, unless it is intended to avow that the Church is to assume the place of the Church's Head, and to be revered, served, and trusted, instead of him. No one will deny our right to maintain Church principles, in preference to the principles of the Presbyterian or Independent. But, on the other hand, I must think that to set up, as it were, Church principles in opposition to the principles of the Gospel, and place them in invidious contrast, is alike unreasonable and unscriptural. It is to confound the means of grace with the Author of grace—to worship the thing made, and to dishonour the Maker. It is to array against Christ the instrumentality which he has established against Satan. He appointed his ministers that there might be a perpetual provision for opposing 'the power of darkness'—a perpetual provision for carrying into effect, through conviction, and conversion, and sanctification, his merciful purpose of 'bringing many sons to glory.' He instituted his sacraments, that they who observed them might be a visible body of witnesses to him in the world, and that, after the usual manner of the divine operations, there might be known and manifest channels in which his Spirit might flow, to the edification and comfort of believers.

" Therefore he ordained the ministry, and he ordained the sacraments, that there might be a Church—a continual 'congregation of faithful men.' And shall this Church boast itself against its Author, and claim a power which he has never given ? Shall the earthly members assume the authority of their heavenly Principal ? Such seems to be the case, when they confound Church membership with faith, or so magnify the ministrations belonging to their office as virtually to represent that, except through their instrumentality, there is no salvation." (*Charge*, pp. 30-36.)

The Bishop of WINCHESTER :—

" I cannot but fear the consequences for the character, the efficiency, and the very truth of our Church, if a system of teaching should become extensively popular, which dwells upon the external and ritual parts of

religious service, whilst it loses sight of their inner meaning and spiritual life; which defaces the brightest glory of the Church, by forgetting the continual presence of her Lord, seeming in effect to depose him from his rightful pre-eminence; which speaks of the sacraments, not as seals and pledges, but as instruments of salvation in a justificatory and causal sense; not as eminent means of grace, inasmuch as 'faith is confirmed and grace increased' in them, as our Article speaks; not as that they 'be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace,' as our Article speaks again; but as if they were the only sources of divine grace, to the exclusion of any other; *the* means; *the* keys of the kingdom;* deprecating, as superstitious, an 'apprehension of resting in them,'† and investing them with a saving intrinsic efficacy, not distinguishable by ordinary understandings from the *opus operatum*; which tends to substitute, at least in unholy minds, for the worship in spirit and in truth, the observance of 'days, and months, and times, and years;' for the cheerful obedience of filial love, an aspect of hesitation, and trouble, and doubt; for the freedom of the Gospel, a spirit of bondage; for the ways of pleasantness, and the peace which passeth all understanding, the valley of Baca and a body of death; which works out salvation, indeed, with fear and trembling, but without any foretaste of the rest that remaineth for the people of God, and without joy in believing." (*Charge*, pp. 37, 38.)

6. *Sin after Baptism.*

The Bishop of RION:—

"It cannot but excite surprise and deep regret that the effect of sin after baptism should have been placed by them in so gloomy and cheerless a light, unwarranted, as we believe, either by holy Scripture, or by the authority of our Church. Did she really teach, that if we sin again after baptism there is no more such complete absolution in this life as was then imparted, and we could then never attain to the same state of undisturbed security in which God had thus placed us—if she sanctioned the conclusion that the penitent and believing sinner had no promised security for the fullest and freest pardon through the atoning blood of Christ, not only for his original sin, but also for all his actual sins committed subsequent to baptism, how could she have bid her ministers open the daily service of the Church with a declaration that, if we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness? What comfort could it bring to the offender to be told that all his inherited corruption is washed away, and his original guilt pardoned through the merits of his Saviour, if he is at the same time to be reminded that there is no full security against the wrath of God for his numberless transgressions in after life? Or how can the priest venture to pronounce that God pardoneth and absolveth *all* that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel—how speak of Almighty God as so putting away the sins of those who truly repent that he remembereth them no more, if the pardon of sin after baptism stands upon a different footing from that committed before—if the promise of God is not equally sure and certain as regards both? Surely, my reverend brethren, if the *faithfulness* and

* "The keys that can open and shut the kingdom of heaven, we, with St. Chrysostom, call the knowledge of the Scriptures; with Tertullian, the interpretation of the law; with Eusebius, the word of God." (*Jewel's Apology*.)

† Advertisement to vol. ii. of "Tracts for the Times," p. 5.

justice of God are *both*, as the holy Scripture declares, pledged for the forgiveness of *all* the penitent believer's unrighteousness, without distinction, his security for the pardon of the one must be as great as that for the other : and this is exactly in accordance with the doctrine laid down in our Homily on Repentance, wherein it is said, 'Although we do, after we be once come to God, and grafted in his Son Jesus Christ, fall into great sins ; yet if we rise again by repentance, and with a full purpose of amendment of life, do flee unto the mercy of God, taking sure hold thereupon, through faith in his Son Jesus Christ, there is an *assured and infallible hope* of pardon and remission of the same, and that we shall be received again into the favour of our heavenly Father.' Again, the same Homily, speaking of the holy Scriptures, saith that they 'pronounce unto *all* true repentant sinners, and to them that will with their whole heart turn unto the Lord their God, free pardon and remission of sins.' Let a belief inconsistent with these declarations become prevalent and popular, and we shall, ere long, I fear, find the conscience-stricken sinner resorting to fasting and self-denial, not merely as instruments of self-discipline, to keep the body under, or as a help to prayer (and when limited to these objects we know them to be truly scriptural, and godly, and edifying), but as a means of making satisfaction for sins, from whose penalty he feels no security that the vicarious sufferings of Christ will deliver him. It need not, however, be imagined that the most ample conviction of God's forgiveness of all our sins, for his dear Son's sake, does in any degree interfere with the necessity of a deep humiliation, of an earnest and unfeigned contrition for past transgression. We should rather believe that the stronger the sense of God's pardoning mercy through Christ, the stronger would be the feeling of indignation at wilful sin, the more vehement the zeal and the revenge against ourselves on account of it. It may, indeed, be very true that rash and hasty declarations are sometimes made as to individual cases ; that the wound of the wilful sinner may in some instances have been too slightly healed ; and that the minister, in his eagerness to vindicate the cardinal doctrine of the Gospel, that, being justified by faith, we have peace with God, may have been tempted, before there has been adequate proof that the sorrow is godly sorrow, to administer to the soul the full consolations of grace ; but if we once admit the notion, that God's promise does not give security, I know not how the Church militant on earth can ever hope to enjoy that peace of God which passeth all understanding." (*Charge*, p. 20-23.)

7. *Prayers for the Dead.*

The Bishop of EXETER :—

"I lament, too, the encouragement given by the same writers to the dangerous practice of prayer for the dead. They disclaim, indeed, the intention of giving such encouragement, and I doubt not the sincerity of their disclaimer. But to state that this practice 'is a matter of sacred consolation to those who feel themselves justified in entertaining it'* (and all, they seem to suggest, may '*feel themselves* justified,' for it is 'warranted by the early Church')—to say, further, that this is 'a solemn privilege to the mourner'—'a dictate of human nature' ; nay, that 'may be implanted by the God of nature, may be the voice of God within us'—to say all this is surely an 'encouragement' of the practice so characterized, which is very feebly counterbalanced by their admitting that

* Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, p, 186, et seq.

‘our Church does not encourage it,’ by their abstaining from in ‘any way inculcating it,’ or even by their thinking ‘it inexpedient to bring forward such a topic in public discussion.’

“Nor do I assent to their opinion, ‘that our Church does not discourage’ prayer for the dead; on the contrary, if, as they admit, the Church, having at first adopted such prayer, in the general words in which it was used in the ancient Liturgies, afterwards, ‘for the safety of her children, relinquished the practice,’ even in this sober and harmless form, ‘in consequence of abuses connected with it in the Romish system’—abuses, of the least of which she says that they are ‘grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God;’ while of others she declares, that they ‘were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits:’ I can hardly propose to myself any more decisive mode of discouraging a practice, which, in itself, could not be condemned as absolutely contrary to God’s word.

“I must go further: I must add, and I do so with unfeigned respect for the integrity and sincerity of these writers, as well as for their eminent ability and learning, that I cannot easily reconcile it with Christian discretion for any member of the Church to speak with so much favour of a practice which was thus deliberately, and for such grave reasons, repudiated by the Church herself. Still less can I understand what justification can be offered for his saying of the Romanist, that in ‘deciding that almost all souls undergo a painful purification after death, by which *infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni,*’ he only ‘follows an instinct of human nature.’ Surely, if this be true, the Romanist is right in his decision: for an instinct of our nature could have come only from the divine author of that nature—it must be, indeed, ‘the voice of God within us.’” (*Charge*, pp. 79, 80.)

8. Dedication of particular Days to the commemoration of deceased men.

The Bishop of EXETER:—

“I cannot but deplore the rashness which has prompted them to recommend to private Christians the dedication of particular days to the religious commemoration of deceased men, and even to furnish a special service in honour of Bishop Ken, formed apparently on the model of an office in the Breviary to a Romish saint. Would it be safe for the Church itself, and is it becoming in private individuals, to pronounce thus confidently on the character of deceased Christians—in other words, to assume the gift of ‘discerning of spirits?’ To what must such a practice be expected to lead? The history of the Church of Rome has told us; and the fathers of our Reformation, in compiling the Liturgy, have marked their sense of the danger, by rejecting every portion of the Breviary which bears on such a practice, even while they adopted all that was really sound and edifying in it. Yet these writers scruple not to recommend this very practice, thus deliberately rejected by those wise and holy men, and (strange to say) recommend it as only ‘completing what our Reformers have begun,’ as ‘a means of carrying out in private, the principle and spirit of those inestimable forms of devotion which are contained in our authorized Prayer-book.’” * (*Charge*, p. 81.)

9. *Against reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge, especially the Doctrine of the Atonement.*

The Bishop of GLOUCESTER and BRISTOL :—

“I cannot help regretting that any members of our Church should have recommended reserve in declaring to the people any part of the doctrines of Scripture : I regard it as contrary to the apostolic practice to refuse to ‘declare all the counsel of God’—and as tending to rob us of one of the greatest blessings which flow from a pure religion, whereby the book of life is freely and unreservedly laid open to mankind. The duty of ‘searching the Scriptures’ is not confined to the minister ; it attaches itself to every Christian who can read them. There is no more dangerous doctrine than that of leaving to the judgment of fallible man what parts of God’s word are to be published, and what are to be kept back ; and I am disposed to believe that the authors of such a proposition did not themselves sufficiently consider the consequences which might follow its adoption. But of all subjects, that which it would, I think, be most inexcusable to keep back from the people, is the atonement made by our blessed Saviour for the sins of mankind ; since upon that truth must ever rest the key-stone of the Christian edifice. That Christ died to save sinners, that our nature had become corrupt and depraved through sin, and that by the sacrifice of our blessed Lord upon the cross once offered, atonement and satisfaction were made, and the wrath of God averted, are among the first truths which we communicate to the youthful Christian ; they are likewise inculcated in the reception of the blessed eucharist, as well as in various parts of the formularies of our Church. Upon what principle, then, can they be held back in our Christian teaching ? It is true that this doctrine may be distorted and misrepresented, and that sinners may be led to flatter themselves with hopes of being saved while they continue in their sin. But ‘we have not so learned Christ ;’ nor are we afraid to declare to the people ‘the riches of his grace,’ because some presumptuous men have rushed into the errors which the apostles themselves noted among contemporary heresies. Were we ashamed to declare ‘all the counsel of God,’ as we have received it from the Scriptures, we should at once forfeit the title of an Apostolical Church. Let us not, therefore, cease to proclaim ‘Christ crucified,’ as the most important commission of our ministry, and as the sole ground upon which we teach our hearers to rest their hopes of forgiveness and reconciliation to God.” (*Charge*, pp. 32-34.)

The Bishop of EXETER :—

“I lament, and more than lament, the tendency at least, if not the direct import, of some of their views ‘on reserve in communicating religious knowledge,’ especially their venturing to recommend it to us to keep back from any who are baptized the explicit and full declaration of the doctrine of the atonement.* I know not how such reserve can be made consistent, not only with the general duty of the Christian minister, to be able, at all times, to say, with St. Paul, that he ‘has not shunned to declare all the counsel of God ;’ but also with the special and distinct requirement of our own Church, that every *child* be taught the catechism : for I need not remind you that in the catechism this great article of our faith holds a most prominent place—that it is there taught,

* No. 80, p. 74.

both by plain implication, in saying that God the Son hath *redeemed* us ; again in the inward grace of each sacrament ; and more explicitly and expressly in the reason, ‘ why the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was ordained,’ viz., ‘ for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby.’ How is the meaning of these passages to be taught without also teaching the doctrine of the atonement ?” (*Charge*, p. 84.)

The Bishop of WINCHESTER :—

“ There is ground for fear, if a system of reserve in communicating religious knowledge be introduced, and we are taught to treat salvation by grace as ‘ a great secret,’ to be kept out of the sight of the ungodly for fear of an ‘ indelicate exposure of religion,’ and that ‘ to require from both grown persons and children an explicit declaration of a belief in the atonement, and the full assurance of its power, appears equally untenable.’ Is this conclusion drawn from the analogy of our blessed Lord’s own teaching ? We, I trust, have not so learned Christ. We remember how, in the very earliest days of his ministry, he did not hesitate to bring forward some of the highest doctrines. At the first passover he assumed a right over his Father’s house by cleansing the temple—a declaration of the divine prerogative of the strongest kind. His discourse with Nicodemus is based upon the doctrine of regeneration—the deepest theological truth. His conversation with the woman of Samaria revealed that God is a spirit—the most abstract metaphysical truth. In declaring to the people of Nazareth, that to none of the widows in Israel was Elias sent, ‘ save unto Sarepta, a city of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow,’ he taught the doctrine of election—the most mysterious of the divine purposes. We remember how, some months before his crucifixion, he intimates the sacrifice itself and its object : ‘ Destroy this temple ;’ ‘ The Son of Man must be lifted up ;’ ‘ The bread that I give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.’ And it was his last care, immediately before the ascension, to enter with the eleven into the full explanation of his expiatory sacrifice, referring to his former discourses, and interpreting their meaning, that the apostles, and after them in turn their successors, might be competent expounders of this important doctrine.*

“ Neither have we so learned the practice of the apostles. It was not by throwing a veil over the cross of Christ that St. Paul showed his reverence for that high and holy mystery. ‘ I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.’ ‘ I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures.’ He takes the Galatians to witness that Jesus Christ had been evidently set forth before their eyes, crucified among them. So far is he from shrinking from the theme, as too sacred and awful for speech, that he glories in giving it explicit prominence, even in the midst of those who could not receive the truth. ‘ We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness.’* ”

* John ii. 19 ; iii. 14 ; vi. 51 ; Luke xxiv. 44-47. See “ Ministerial Character of Christ,” p. 169.

* 1 Cor. xi. 2 ; xv. 3. Gal. iii. 1. 1 Cor. i. 23. A very peculiar interpretation is given in Tract 80, 73-75, of the expressions “ Christ crucified,” &c., namely, that when St. Paul says “ we preach Christ crucified,” it means “ the necessity of our being crucified to the world, and our humiliation together with

"Neither have we so learned the requirements of our Church, which expects that out of the mouths of the very babes and sucklings God will perfect praise. The earliest Christian lesson which she bids us teach our children is, that 'God the Son hath redeemed us.'

"Neither have we so learned in the school of experience. The whole history of the Church, in every age, tends to prove the utter inefficiency of a ministry which is not faithful in honouring the Saviour, by a full exhibition of his grace and love, in pointing to the light which beams from the cross, and in proclaiming openly, 'Behold the Lamb of God.' The experiment has been often tried. It has been tried upon individuals; it has been tried upon parishes; it has been tried upon whole countries; and many a conscientious pen has been constrained to write the record of its utter failure.* Could it be otherwise, when our Master has said, 'I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me?' Could it be otherwise, 'lest the cross of Christ be made of none effect?'" (*Charge*, pp. 30-33.)

The Bishop of CHESTER has some admirable remarks (*Charge*, pp. 22-29) on this subject, which we reluctantly omit for want of room.

10. *Transubstantiation.*

The Bishop of EXETER :—

"Again I lament to read their advice to those who are contending for the truth against Romanists, that 'the controversy about transubstantiation be kept in the background; because it cannot well be discussed in words at all without the sacrifice of godly fear : '† as if that tenet were not the abundant source of enormous practical evils, which the faithful advocate of the truth is bound to expose; in particular, of the extravagant exaltation of the Romish priesthood, which seems to have been its primary object; and, still worse, of that which is its legitimate and necessary consequence, the adoration of the sacramental bread and wine, which our Church denounces as 'idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.' " (*Charge*, pp. 78, 79.)

11. *Speaking in soft language of the Corruptions of the Romish Church.*

The Bishop of WINCHESTER :—

"There is ground again for fear, if, on the one hand, it becomes habitual among us to extenuate and speak in soft language of the deep corruptions of the Church of Rome, dwelling upon her 'high gifts and strong claims on our admiration, reverence, love, and gratitude; '‡ attributing to her, of all other religious communions, the exclusive possession of that something to which the age is moving; § and characterizing sim-

him." Professor Scholefield, in the Appendix to his Second Sermon on Scriptural Grounds of Union, preached before the University of Cambridge in 1840, has critically examined this interpretation, and convincingly shows its untenableness.

* See "Ministerial Character of Christ," pp. 442, 443.

† "Tracts for the Times," No. 71, page 9.

‡ Tract 70, No. 24, page 7.

§ "In truth, there is at this moment a great progress of the religious mind of our Church to something deeper and truer than satisfied the last century."
 "The age is moving towards something, and, most unhappily, the one

ply as an 'event in Providence'* that Papal supremacy of which Bishop Taylor writes, that it 'will not be necessary to declare the sentence of the Church of England and Ireland, because it is notorious to all the world, and is expressly opposed against this Romish doctrine, by laws, articles, confessions, homilies, the oath of allegiance and supremacy, the book of Christian Institution, and many excellent writings: '† and if, on the other hand, in the same breath, we accustom ourselves to speak slightly and disparagingly of those great and venerable names of the sixteenth century, of whom one of the ablest and wisest of modern authorities has said, that 'we shall search in vain, either in ancient or modern history, for examples of men more justly entitled to the praise of splendid talents, sound learning, and genuine piety'‡—or if we learn to designate the blessed Reformation itself as 'that great schism' which 'shattered' the *sacramentum unitatis*, since which era 'truth has not dwelt simply and securely in any visible tabernacle'§—or if we undervalue our own liturgy, and formularies, and homilies—or put interpretations on our Articles at variance with what has been generally received as the intentions of their compilers, and inconsistent with the royal declaration, that 'no man.....shall put his own sense or comment to be the meaning.'" (*Charge*, pp. 35, 36.)

In the Appendix the Bishop of WINCHESTER adduces proofs from the writings of the Tractarians, which abundantly corroborate the truth of his remarks.

12. *The Tractarians explaining away of the Thirty-nine Articles.—The proper Interpretation of them.*

The Bishop of GLOUCESTER and BRISTOL :—

"The perusal of the 'Remarks upon the Thirty-nine Articles' has filled me with astonishment and concern. The ostensible object of this tract is to show that a person adopting the doctrines of the Council of Trent, with the single exception of the Pope's supremacy, might sincerely and conscientiously sign the Articles of the Church of England. But the real object at which the writer seems to be labouring is to prove that the differences in doctrine which separate the Churches of England and Rome will, upon examination, vanish. Upon this point much ingenuity, and, I am forced to add, much sophistry, is exerted, and I think exerted in vain. It is well known that the Articles were framed, in a great degree, with the view of purifying the Church from Romish abuses, and that the framers themselves were those ever-honoured martyrs, who, having accomplished the good work of Reformation, with unexampled forbearance and discretion, sealed the testimony of their sincerity by cheerfully submitting to the flames of Romish persecution." (*Charge*, pp. 35, 36.)

religious community among us, which has of late years been practically in possession of this something, is the Church of Rome. She alone, amid all the errors and evils of her practical system, has given free scope to the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings, which may be especially called Catholic." (*Letter to Dr. Jelf, by the Author of Tract 90*, pp. 25, 26.)

* Tract 90, p. 77. † "Dissuasive from Popery," vol x., p. 260.

‡ Bishop Van Mildert's Lectures, vol i., p. 288. § Tract 71, p. 29.

The Bishop of RIPON:—

“There is one more subject, my reverend brethren, on which so much discussion has recently arisen, that you may, I think, fairly expect some expression of opinion upon it before I close this address. I allude to the legitimate mode of interpreting our Articles. Now it will be most freely granted that our Articles do leave some questions open, where the word of God itself leaves them undecided; and I think that he does no good service to religion or the Church who labours to give a more stringent interpretation to their language than the expressions will fairly warrant. Nay, farther, I would say that those who strive thus unnecessarily to limit the terms of communion are the real schismatics, not those who may find themselves forced beyond the pale of the Church by restrictions unduly imposed. It is clear, however, that there must be limits beyond which this forbearance cannot be carried; and I confess that when I find it asserted that ‘the Articles are to be received, not in the sense of the framers, but (as far as the wording will admit, or any ambiguity requires it) in the one Catholic sense,’* the integrity of subscription appears to be endangered. In the case either of oath or subscription, the *animus imponentis*, by which I mean the sense of the framer, should surely be the index of the sense in which it is to be made or taken. There can be but one true and legitimate meaning to an Article, and that must be the meaning intended by the framer. Nor should I myself feel justified in taking advantage of any ambiguity in the wording, and affixing what, according to my own notion, might be the Catholic sense to it, until I had found it impossible to ascertain what was the special sense originally designed by the authors: for, knowing the respect in which our Reformers held Catholic antiquity, I should believe that *they* were more likely to have correctly embodied that sense in it than *I*, as an individual, should be to discover that sense for myself.” (*Charge*,† pp. 24, 25.)

Any observations we could offer would only tend to weaken the preceding just and forcible remarks; but we cannot refrain from tendering the humble meed of our thanks to these our right reverend fathers, who have thus nobly stood forward, and have pronounced their deliberate condemnations of the sentiments and practices which are enforced in the so-called “Tracts for the Times.”

The Tractarians have confidently affirmed that, “in the seventeenth century, the theology of the body of the English Church was substantially the same as theirs.”‡ As far as respects Bishop Hall, our readers, on referring to page 140 *supra*, will see that the Bishop of Exeter has vindicated that distinguished author and divine from the appearance of advocating principles like those of the Tractarians. It is, indeed, by no means diffi-

* See the Rev. Mr. Newman’s Letter to Dr. Jelf, in explanation of No. 90 of the “Tracts for the Times,” page 24, second edition.

† The Bishop of Ripon applies these observations, at considerable length, to the true interpretation of the twenty-second Article, for which we have not room.

‡ Tracts No. 38, p. 11.

cult to construct “a modern *Catena Patrum*” out of what Professor Faussett (whose monitory voice was early raised against Tractarian errors) has happily termed “*one-sided quotations*.” (*Lecture*, p. 30.) Even if such quotations were fairly and fully given, unless an *unbroken* series of ALL our theological writers were produced (which, in fact, cannot be produced), such quotations could only exhibit the unauthorized sentiments of private individuals, which sentiments are of weight only so far as they are borne out by the Scriptures, and (subordinately to them) by the Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies of our Church. What the Bishop of Lincoln has said respecting the degree of deference to be conceded to the early ecclesiastical writers, who are commonly termed the “Fathers of the Church,” is equally applicable to later ecclesiastical authors, viz., “*When they put forth their own arguments in defence of the rule of faith, or their own interpretations of Scripture, we no longer regard them as witnesses, but as reasoners ; and WE PAY NO GREATER DEFERENCE TO THEIR AUTHORITY, THAN TO THAT OF OTHER GOOD AND PIOUS BUT FALLIBLE MEN.*” †

We have said above, “if such quotations were fairly and fully given :” because such is the infirmity of the human mind, that, when it is devoted exclusively to the maintenance of some favourite dogma, it is but too prone to imagine that it finds proofs where no proofs really exist, and where none could be found, if the context of the passage cited were fully given. Mr. Newman (whose character needs no eulogium from us) is himself an instance of this mental infirmity. In No. 90, pages 73 and 74, he has given ten short paragraphs (by him numbered 51 to 60), from the eleventh of the second Book of Homilies, for the purpose of proving that what in page 75 he calls “the propitiatory virtue of good works,” is “taught in the Homilies.” We select a few instances in corroboration of the preceding remark :—

“56. ‘Merciful alms-dealing is *profitable* to *purge* the soul from the *infection and filthy spots of sin.*’ (*Ibid.*)—[i. e., 2 B. xi. 2.]

“57. ‘The same lesson *doth the HOLY GHOST teach* in sundry places of the *Scripture*, saying, “Mercifulness and almsgiving,” &c. [Tobit iv.]The wise preacher, the son of Sirach, confirmeth the same, when he says, that “as water quencheth burning fire,”’ &c. (*Ibid.*)

“58. ‘A great *confidence* may they have *before the high God*, that show mercy and compassion to them that are afflicted.’ (*Ibid.*)

“59. ‘If ye have by any infirmity or weakness been touched and annoyed with them, straightway shall mercifulness *wipe and wash them away, as salves and remedies* to heal their sores and grievous diseases.’—*Ibid.*

“60. ‘And therefore that *holy father* Cyprian admonisheth to consider how *wholesome* and *profitable* it is to relieve the needy, &c. by the *which* we may *purge our sins* and *heal our wounded souls.*’—*Ibid.*” *

Mr. Newman, however, has omitted to give the paragraphs which immediately follow the preceding passages, and which are *directly opposed* to the dogma in support of which he has cited them.

“But yet some will say unto me, if almsgiving, and our charitable works towards the poor, be able to wash away sins, to reconcile us to God, to deliver us from the peril of damnation, and make us the sons and heirs of God’s kingdom—then are Christ’s merits defaced, and his blood shed in vain—then are we justified by works, and by our deeds may we merit heaven—then do we in vain believe that Christ died for to put away our sins, and that he rose for our justification, as St. Paul teacheth. But ye shall understand, dearly beloved, *that NEITHER those places of the Scripture before alleged, NEITHER the doctrine of the blessed martyr Cyprian, NEITHER any other godly and learned man*, when they, in extolling the dignity, profit, fruit, and effect of virtuous and liberal alms, do say that it washeth away sins and bringeth us to the favour of God, *do mean that our work and charitable deed is the original cause of our acception before God, or that for the dignity or worthiness thereof our sins may be washed away and we purged and cleansed of all the spots of our iniquity*; FOR THAT WERE, INDEED, TO DEFACE CHRIST, AND TO DEFRAUD HIM OF HIS GLORY: *but they mean this*—and this is the understanding of those and such like sayings—*that God of his mercy and special favour towards them, whom he hath appointed to everlasting salvation, hath so offered his grace especially, and they have so received it fruitfully*, that although, by reason of their sinful living outwardly, they seemed before to have been the children of wrath and perdition; *yet now, the Spirit of God mightily working in them, unto obedience to God’s will and commandments, they declare, by their outward deeds and life*, in the showing of mercy and charity (which cannot come but of the Spirit of God, and his especial grace), *that they are the undoubted children of God appointed to everlasting life*. And so, as by their wickedness and ungodly living they showed themselves, according to the judgment of men, which follow the outward appearance, to be reprobates and cast-aways; so now, by their obedience unto God’s holy will, and by their mercifulness and tender pity, (wherein they show themselves to be like unto God, who is the fountain and spring of all mercy,) they declare openly and manifestly unto the sight of men that they are the sons of God, and elect of him unto salvation. For as the good fruit is not the cause that the tree is good, but the tree must first be good before it can bring forth good fruit; so the good deeds of man are not the cause that maketh man good, but he is first made good by the Spirit and grace of God, that effectually worketh in him, and afterward he bringeth forth good fruits. And then, as the good fruit doth argue the goodness of the tree, so doth the good and merciful deed of the man argue and certainly prove the goodness of him that doth it, according to Christ’s sayings, ‘Ye shall know them by their fruits.’ * * * *

“The meaning, then, of these sayings, in the Scriptures and other holy writings—alms-deeds do wash away our sins, and mercy to the poor doth blot out our offences—is, *that we*, doing these things according to God’s will and our duty, *have our sins indeed washed away, and our offences blotted out, not for the worthiness of them, BUT BY THE GRACE OF God*, which worketh all in all, and that for the promise that God hath made to them that are obedient unto his commandment, that He which

is the Truth might be justified in performing the truth due to his true promise. *Alms-deeds do wash away our sins, because God doth vouchsafe them to repute us as clean and pure, when we do them for his sake, and NOT because they deserve or merit our purging, or for that they have any such strength and virtue in themselves.*

“I know that some men, too much addict to the advancing of their works, will not be contented with this answer; and no marvel, for such men can no answer content or suffice. Wherefore, leaving them to their own wilful sense, we will rather have regard to the reasonable and godly, who, as they most certainly know and persuade themselves that all goodness, all bounty, all mercy, all benefits, all forgiveness of sins, and whatsoever can be named good and profitable, either for the body or for the soul, do come only of God’s mercy and mere favour, and not of themselves; so, though they do never so many and so excellent good deeds, yet are they never puffed up with the vain confidence of them.” (*Sermons or Homilies appointed to be read in Churches, &c*, pp. 328-330. Oxford, 1802.)

Here we beg our readers attentively to observe, that so far is the “second part of the” Homily or “Sermon of alms-deeds” from setting forth what Mr. Newman’s quotations would insinuate, viz., “the propitiatory virtue of good works,” in “purging the soul from the infection and filthy spots of sin,” or “wiping and washing them [*i. e.*, sins] away,” or “purging our sins,” or “healing our wounded souls;” that, on the contrary, the connecting and immediately subsequent paragraphs not only positively affirm the opposite doctrine, but also declare that to give alms from the motives indicated in Mr. Newman’s quotations is, “*to deface Christ and to DEFRAUD HIM OF HIS GLORY;*” and they further assert, “that all goodness, all bounty, all mercy, all benefits, all forgiveness of sins, and whatever can be named good and profitable, either for the body or the soul, *do come ONLY of GOD’S MERCY AND MERE FAVOUR, and NOT of themselves.*”

The conduct of the Tractarians in evading the plain, obvious, and grammatical sense of the Articles of our Church, and in endeavouring to reconcile them with the adoption of the very errors which they were designed to counteract, has been ably exposed by the Rev. Dr. Faussett, the Lady Margaret’s Professor of Divinity at Oxford, in his “Lecture on the Thirty-nine Articles considered as the Standard and Test of the Doctrines of the Church of England.” (No. 17.) From this temperate and well-written discourse we could gladly have transferred numerous passages to our pages, did not the length to which the present article has unavoidably extended prohibit the insertion of them. The Professor’s lecture, doubtless, has been and will be attentively perused: it especially claims the notice of those who are about to subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles of our Church, previously to their ordination, or their institution to any benefice.

To conclude:—However Dr. Wiseman may flatter himself that

“the way” for reducing the British Church and nation to the yoke of Rome “is in part prepared by the demonstration that such interpretation may be given of the most difficult Articles, as may strip them of all contradiction to the decrees of the Tridentine synod,” * we feel assured that so long as the Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies of our Church,† together with the un-mutilated and unfalsified Scriptures of truth, are in the hands of the people, and the discourses of the clergy are based upon and conformable to these—so long our Reformed Protestant Church will continue to be—what she has been ever since the sixteenth century—the bulwark of the Reformation, and a standing witness against the modern unscriptural and antiscritptural tenets and practices of Popery.

* * *Addendum to page 136, lines 20 to 27.* After the sheet containing page 136 had been worked off, and just as the present sheet was actually going to press, a printed letter addressed to the Rev. Dr. Pusey, by the Rev. W. G. Ward, appeared in the *St. James's Chronicle* of December 9th, 1841, containing strictures on the Rev. C. P. Golightly's letter to the *Standard* newspaper. The only part of Mr. Ward's communication, with which the preceding article is concerned, is the extract given in page 136, as illustrating the tendency of Tractarianism towards Popery. In justice to Mr. Ward, we give *his* statement of the fact there referred to. Having quoted the passage in question, Mr. Ward says:—

“I called on Mr. Golightly's informant, a gentleman who considers himself, as Mr. Golightly says, to differ very widely from those opinions which I have been taught to receive as true, but who is wholly incapable of the least approach to intentional mis-statement. From him I learnt that the conversation alluded to took place *several months since*, though he had only mentioned it to Mr. Golightly within the present month [meaning, we suppose, November; for Mr. Ward's statement has no date]. I am speaking on his authority when I say, that his account of this conversation was, as nearly as possible, what follows:—Mr. Golightly was expressing his suspicions that yourself and Mr. Newman differed in your manner of regarding the Church of Rome; and his friend answered, ‘Ward recognises a distinction between them in that respect, and says that *SOME FOLLOW THE ONE, SOME THE OTHER*;’ *he says that Pusey has a strong feeling against Rome, but Newman no such feeling at all.*”

As we have adopted Mr. Golightly's quotation, printing a portion of it in capital letters, in justice to Mr. Ward, we print the most material part of his statement in the same type. Mr. Ward “thinks the difference between this statement and Mr. Golightly's not altogether unimportant.” Our readers will observe that Mr. Golightly, speaking of the disciples of Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman, represented his informant as saying, “the latter opposed, the former no longer opposed, to Rome.” Mr. Ward represents the same informant as saying, “that some follow the one, some the other.” To us, the representation appears to be a distinction without a difference: for the *sense* is much the same. Our readers, however, shall judge for themselves. (*December 10th, 1841.*)

* “Letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury,” p. 38.

† The Homilies are “enlarged comments on the Articles, particularly on those parts of them which are directed against the gross corruptions of the Romish Church.” (*Archdeacon Daubeny's Protestant Companion*, p. 112.)

ART. VII.—*The State of Ireland considered, and Measures proposed for Restoring Tranquillity to that Country.* By the Right Hon. Lord ALVANLEY. London: Ollivier. 1841.

2. *A Digest of the Penal Laws passed against Catholics, with Historical Notes and Illustrations.* By the Rev. J. WATERWORTH. Newark. 1841.

3. *A Letter on Catholic Unity, addressed to the Right Hon. the Earl of Shrewsbury.* By NICHOLAS, Bishop of Melipotamus. London: Dolman. 1841.

4. *Exeter Hall, or Church Polemics.* By ALEXANDER BAILLIE COCHRANE, Esq., M.P. for Bridport. London: Painter. 1841.

SINCE that primeval day when “the Lord God said, it is not good that the man should be alone,” how many forms of unity has man, with painful trial, and ceaseless labour, and baffled ingenuity, moulded and fashioned for himself! Peace and war, political institutions, heathen religions, revolutions, invasions, tyrannies, and democracies, have all had unity, in one shape or other—more or less aimed at and acknowledged as the *το καλον* on earth; and now for nearly these 2,000 years have Christians been accustomed to see in it a foreshadowing of the eternal kingdom of the Prince of peace. But as, on the one hand, never, perhaps, since Constantine hallowed the sceptre of earthly empire by stamping it with the cross, has Europe presented a more broken and disjointed appearance than she presents now: so, on the other, never, perhaps, were more fitful endeavours made, especially in this country, after unity; and never surely did the blind cleverness of man hew more broken cisterns wherein to turn the various streams of political and religious disquiet and excitement, which could not be contained in them. Who can look steadily for one moment at the present state of English society, and mark the feverish eagerness with which the different classes strive to gather up and combine together a hundred discordant elements, in Trades’ Unions, Reform Clubs, Conservative Associations, Poor Law Unions, Friendly Societies, Temperance Societies, Mechanics’ Institutes, and numberless other vain images of *oneness*, without acknowledging that there exists, not here and there, not in this class or that, but everywhere, and throughout the people—a general yearning after unity, of which these are alike the proofs and the fruits? Sad indeed is it to an English Churchman to see the one authorized symbol and centre of unity disregarded, and his countrymen, like the builders of Babel, hurrying hither and thither after vanities and spe-

ciosities, and crying out peace where there is no peace; sad indeed—but not altogether so—for still there our mother sits on her holy hill, dispensing her gifts and graces to all who come to her; and there shall she sit, according to the promise of her heavenly Lord and Master, as long as the world endures.

Not sad altogether: still in each town and hamlet throughout broad England are there hearts that throb in unison with the Church; and day by day does their number increase, as the branches of that tree, which was once a grain of mustard-seed, spread themselves still wider and higher into the firmament of heaven. On all sides of us are new churches rising; in places sacred, as it seemed, to want, and woe, and blasphemy, and darkness, are heard the soothing strains of Church music, and seen the first faint rays of celestial light: the spirit that bade our nameless forefathers rear our magnificent cathedrals seems again to be at work, and men begin to dedicate once more their wealth to the service of God and his Church. What a sight was that which Leeds presented to Christian eyes some few months ago! Truly that was no common dedication of a church to God which was graced by the presence of the aged and venerated Metropolitan of York, of a famous bishop of the far west, and of another from the chilling soil of Scotland: assuredly there was a meaning in that meeting—a practical proof of the catholicism of the English Church, and a pledge and earnest of that unity wherewith the Church universal shall be blessed in God's good time.

If, as we fear is the case in too many instances, the Church has lost her influence over the minds of the people—if the Chartist or the Socialist scoff at her discipline, and hold themselves aloof from her service, this sad result has sprung from bygone years of hard, frigid, and cramping Erastianism, and the dead and nerveless inactivity produced in the Church thereby; but those years, thank God! are passed; and now, holding before the eyes of the people the cross of Christ, appealing to her apostolical succession, arguing by deeds of love and mercy, clothing herself in her "robes of old renown," and proving herself to be the mother of fair love, and fear, and knowledge, and holy hope,* she is daily striking her roots deeper and deeper into the heart of the English nation, and moulding the minds of the people to do her holy will.

This it is that bids us not despair for England; this is it that, amidst all the turmoil, and unrest, and rebuke around us, enables us to look forward with quiet confidence to the future. The

* *Eccles. xlv. 18.*

Church in England is emphatically and essentially the Church of England—the holy centre wherein meet the hopes, the fears, the joys, the sorrows, and the affections of the people of England.

But can the same be said of the Church in Ireland? Is she, too, the Church of Ireland? Alas for that country! In the negative which must answer that question is told the tale of her three centuries of unhappiness. We are far from meaning that no other causes have materially helped to bring about or aggravate that unhappiness: far from meaning that; but still the chief solution of the difficult problem of Irish suffering is, we repeat, to be discovered in that painful fact—in no real way is the Church in Ireland the Church of Ireland: and the great merit of Lord Alvanley's pamphlet is, that he seems to have fully realized this important truth, and has devoted his abilities, which, in spite of our dissent from many of his views, we are disposed to rate highly, to the exposure of the most marked defects of ecclesiastical arrangements in that country, and to the pointing out of remedies for them.

He opens the subject by stating that the power of the Roman Catholic priesthood is such as to contravene and abrogate "the first principles of social institutions and of good government," and that they exercise that power "in a manner incompatible with the existence of any government, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, despotic or representative, which, in carrying out its legitimate authority, refuses to bow the head to those who wield that formidable engine." The truth of this alarming statement will, we believe, be generally admitted; and his lordship goes on to say, that "with regard to the Church of Rome, I have had the opportunity of knowing, from communication with some of its most enlightened members, that it views much of the conduct of the Irish Roman Catholic clergy with regret and sorrow." We are able, from our own experience, to give evidence of the prevalence among foreign Roman Catholics of such feelings; indeed, we have good reason for believing that the Pope himself, in a lengthened interview he granted to the Hon. and Rev. Mr. Spencer, previous to that gentleman's departure for England, expressed himself strongly in condemnation of the political conduct of Mr. O'Connell and his allies, and entreated Mr. Spencer to hold himself aloof from them. There is nothing surprising in this: Rome is, in an especial manner, the symbol of antiquity and stationary power to mankind; the very corruptions wherewith she has overlaid the precious deposit of truth committed to her charge cry out against innovation; and every successful revolution—every disorganization of esta-

blished orders of things—every violent change of dynasty—nay, all political agitation, be it even peaceable, in these later times, however for a moment it may seem to advance her interests, cannot fail ultimately in disturbing her throne on the seven hills; and, by giving a triumph to the genius of innovation, to appeal, with more or less effect, against the vaunted unchangeableness of the apostolic see.

Look at France, Spain, Portugal, nay, even Belgium, and behold how in all these countries the Church of Rome has suffered from the violent changes that have taken place in their governments. To Belgium we especially refer, because the stupid revolution in that country was effected by the Roman Catholic priests; because their views, wishes, and conduct remarkably coincide with those of the Irish Roman Catholic priests and demagogues; and because O'Connell is never tired of citing their example and appealing to their success. No sooner was the victory gained, and Leopold, by the aid of French bayonets, fixed on his throne, than divisions broke out between the two bodies of his supporters; and now the two great opposing parties in Belgium are the *Catholic* and the *Liberal*! No wonder, then, that the Pope should disapprove of the conduct of the Irish *Liberals*, and no wonder that such men as Lord Shrewsbury, Dr. Wiseman, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Ambrose Phillips, and others among the English Roman Catholics, should refuse to join the motley array that follows the arch-demagogue's green standard.

But, in order to understand the reasons which, during past years, prevailed with some of the English Roman Catholics to side with the disaffected in Ireland, let us take a brief glance at the code of penal laws once in force against them. Lord Alvanley gives a graphic and impartial account of what has been done in Ireland since its conquest by Henry II.; and this, with Mr. Waterworth's "Digest," and Mr. Cochrane's temperate pamphlet, we recommend to all who are disposed to take their views of English history from the publications and speeches of Exeter Hall. We shall therefore proceed, without further preface, to quote a few of the most severe enactments passed in that period against the Romanists. By the 26th Henry VIII., c. 13, it was made *treason*, among other things, to deny to the king the dignity, style, or name of his estate royal, or to call him heretic or schismatic. By the 5th of Eliz., c. 1, any person who shall, by writing, printing, preaching, deed, or act, assert or maintain the authority, jurisdiction, or power of the Bishop of Rome, or of his see, within this realm, shall incur a *præmunire*, and for the

second offence such person shall be guilty of high treason. “It further (says Mr. Hallam,* in terms rather too warm) enacts, with an iniquitous and sanguinary retrospect, that all persons who had ever taken holy orders, or any degree in the Universities, or had been admitted to the practice of the laws, or held any office in their execution, should be bound to take the oath of supremacy, when tendered to them by a bishop, or by commissioners appointed under the great seal.” By the 13th Eliz., c. 2, if any person shall bring into the realm any token or thing called by the name *agnus Dei*, or any crosses, pictures, beads, or such like vain and superstitious things, from the bishop or see of Rome, or from any person authorized or claiming authority from him to allow the same, and shall offer the same to any subject of this realm, to be worn or used, he, and every person who shall receive the same, shall incur a *præmunire*. By the 1st Will., c. 18, commonly called the Act of Toleration, every justice of the peace may require any person that goes to any meeting for the exercise of religion to subscribe the declaration of the 30th Charles II., against Popery, and also to take the oath of allegiance and supremacy, and upon refusal thereof commit him to prison without bail; and if he shall, upon a second tender at the sessions, refuse to make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, he shall be then and there recorded for a Popish recusant convict, and suffer accordingly. By the 1st Will., c. 15, no Papist, or reputed Papist, shall have in his possession any horse above the value of five pounds; and two justices, by their warrant, may authorize any person to search for and seize the same for the use of the king.

We are well aware that the “*imperium in imperio*” maintained by consistent Romanists *theoretically* may justify many of these enactments, and that the circumstances under which Elizabeth was placed rendered those which *she* passed practically necessary for the safety of both State and Sovereign: but it must be remembered that they pressed upon the patriotic as well as the disaffected; and though virtually aimed against rebellion, were directly levelled at Romanism. Again, it may fairly be said that the man who really sought the destruction of the government could not be bound by tests, which he would unhesitatingly take as a matter of policy; so that the brunt of the enactments would necessarily fall on the peaceable and loyal. We do not say that therefore *no* tests should be applied, but we make these remarks to show why some English Romanists have given the weight of their names and influence to the disaffected in Ireland.

* Consti. Hist., i. 155.

Our extracts from Mr. Waterworth's work will enable any of our readers, who may have imagined that liberty of conscience was what Henry VIII. and William of Orange intended, to form something like a just notion of the position in which the English Roman Catholics, with occasional "*purpurei panni*" of toleration under the Stuart kings, were placed, from the Reformation to the beginning of this century; but unsatisfactory as their condition was, that of their Irish brethren was still more so. Lord Alvanley draws by no means too sombre a picture when he says—

"As soon as this act of Parliament (that which declared the Church of England to be also that of Ireland) was passed, and the transfers of property carried into effect through the country, the rulers of the day considered that everything that was necessary had been done, and the idea of converting the mere Irish to the new (why did he not say the true?) faith, either by conciliation, conviction, or even force, never entered into their heads. As long as they remained passive, and permitted the forfeited properties, lay and church, to be quietly enjoyed by their new possessors, they were tacitly allowed to exercise the ancient form of worship, though in the teeth of the severest penalties. If, however, the least movement was made, they were hunted down, and, when caught, treated as rebels and heretics."

Cromwell's atrocities we pass over; they cannot be fairly laid to English laws or English government. From the Restoration to the Revolution, Ireland and her Roman Catholics enjoyed something like peace and gentle treatment.

"The Revolution, however, (says Lord Alvanley) again changed everything: war broke out between the two parties; the struggle was severe, but at length the Irish were vanquished: terror and confiscation, as usual, became the order of the day. A penal code of laws, unheard of for severity,* and demoralizing in nature, was inflicted on the Roman Catholics; and the British authority, which, from the time of the invasion by Henry II. till the battle of the Boyne, had been local and precarious, became general and acknowledged through Ireland."

This good result says *somewhat*, however, in favour of the means whereby it was attained. This, then, was the state of things in Ireland till the close of the last century, when the first gleam of light broke through the darkness that overhung the fortunes of her Roman Catholic children. Gradually, from one mountain top to another, the rising sun of liberality stole on, till in 1829 he filled the whole horizon with his rays, and Roman Catholic disabilities melted like vapours and fogs before him. But, as usual in these days of rapid and too hasty generalization, the just boundary was passed; and not only were the penal laws

* In 1678 a proclamation of banishment was fulminated against Roman Catholic ecclesiastics of all ranks, and another forbade Papists to come into the Castle of Dublin, or to the markets of Drogheda, Cork, Waterford, Limerick, Wexford, Youghal, or Galway.

repealed, but legislative power was given to the sons of an adverse and corrupt Church. "But how comes it, then, (it will be asked) that Ireland is still the stumbling-block in the way of every Government, and that the catalogue of Irish wrongs and Irish claims seems still full and inexhaustible?" Disguise the matter as we may, point out how many Irish landlords live abroad, and show how wrong and vexatious the system of middle men is; inveigh against the recklessness and improvidence of the Irish; lay as much stress as we please on these and similar facts—still, we repeat it, at the bottom of all is the lamentable truth, that the Church in Ireland is not the Church of the affections of the people; and so long as she, who ought to be supreme over the hearts and wills of all, is hated and despised, even while feared, by the many—so long as the Irish peasantry regard her as an unfaithful witness and a hard task-mistress—so long does there exist a cankerworm at the heart of Ireland, poisoning the healthy juices of her body politic at their very springs.

How, then, is this heart-disease to be cured? We confess we can see but two ways. Either follow the precedent afforded us by the recognition, on the part of the State, at the Revolution, of the Presbyterian Kirk in Scotland, and establish, in a somewhat similar manner, the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland; or endeavour religiously and zealously to bring the Irish nation into the fold of the Irish Church. However favourably, as politicians, looking to the *τό σύμμερον*, we might be disposed to regard the former—as Churchmen, we feel that the measure is at once unlawful and inexpedient, nay, even impracticable, and therefore bound to urge the latter alternative: and thus, as far as we are concerned, the question of primary importance relating to Ireland is, how is that Church, which is called the Church of Ireland, to be rendered so in deed and reality?

Experience teaches us that neither immense wealth, great political influence, nor, even the establishment of a pure faith and an apostolic ministry, have been able, during these three hundred years, to alienate the devotion of the Irish people from Rome; and therefore we must look to other quarters than to secular protection for the accomplishment of this great end. Among the mightiest engines that work upon an ancient nation is its language. You may annihilate the great men of a conquered country—you may abrogate its laws, destroy its altars, extirpate its priests, scatter to the winds of heaven its arts, habits, and costumes—but unless you can kill its language, you have left among the withered groves of Dodona the spirit that sanctified their shades, and that shall live to perpetuate in

wrathful mournfulness the memory of your crime, and the certainty of its ultimate punishment. And thus it is in Ireland: in the mud cabin of the peasant, in the rude chapel on the desert waste, does the mighty spirit of a national language, unintelligible to the descendants of her victors, reiterate the wrongs of Ireland, and hallow with a sacramental mysteriousness the imposing rites of her cherished faith. What prospect of success is there for wealth, of which *they* taste not—education, by which *they* profit not—political influence, exercised not for *them*, in a struggle against not only the belief, but the language, and ballads, and cherished recollections and traditions of a believing people?

Men are accustomed to wonder at the small hold the Irish Church has on the Irish people, and marvel at the religious condition of Ireland. Wonder we do, but it is not that her hold is so small: we wonder that she yet retains any, and thankfully acknowledge therein a pledge of God's gracious purposes towards her. It is true that, from time to time, men, like Bishop Bedel and Archbishop Marsh, have raised their voices for an Irish-speaking priesthood; but still up to this moment it has never been recognized as a matter of paramount importance that the Church should speak, or at least be able to speak, the language of her people. We rejoice to hear that a movement towards establishing a fitter condition of things in this respect has now commenced, and that the venerable Primate of Ireland has stamped it with his apostolic sanction. Ere this generation passes away, if it pleases the Lord to spare his heedless Church so long, the peasant of Munster and Connaught may be taught to value the catholicity, and purity, and efficacy of that Church, whom he now regards with mistrust and aversion, by a priest sympathizing in his national feelings, and talking to him in the language of the saints and heroes of his Irish forefathers. As we believe that the intentions of the promoters of this laudable scheme have not yet been made public, it would be premature in us to discuss its various bearings; but beyond a doubt such a step taken by the Irish Church would go further to rectify the evils of Ireland than all the world-wisdoms and earthly expedients of the wisest politicians.* As Lord Alvanley belongs to

* It is true that the Irish Society have not entirely lost sight of this most important auxiliary in their labours. But will it be believed by English Churchmen that the gentleman on whom they most rely to reason with the native Irish is a Presbyterian? What good to the Church can possibly come from his efforts? How is he less a schismatic than the ignorant peasant whom he would fain convince of schism? How should he ask another to return to the bosom of the Church, when he himself disowns her? It is, indeed, most painful to see how the Church in Ireland has been, and we fear in a great mea-

this class, he has not unnaturally overlooked this most important branch of his subject, and confined himself to purely political remedies: these we will now begin to discuss:—

“The first step to be taken (says his lordship) should be a measure for the payment of the Irish Roman Catholic clergy. The present state of the finances would certainly be unfavourable to such a proposition; but the necessity of the case is so urgent, and the advantage to be gained so great and so certain, that I should consider no price that could be paid extravagant which would tend to obtain the object in view.”

Yes! my Lord, there is one price that would be extravagant—one that would render the nation poor indeed, and that without enriching the schismatical Roman Church in Ireland—a price not paid in silver or gold, but in a coin that has of late years been far too much undervalued and far too lavishly squandered—the nation’s duty to the Church. Supposing, then, all other objections removed, Churchmen could never consent to pay such a price, even were they, by so doing, to gain the applause of the world, and the thanks of its most politic children. But in writing on this important subject we will lay aside this objection, and all others which we might be disposed to raise against the State departing, in so very marked a manner, from the course hitherto, more or less, pursued by her in relation to the Church, and consider the question as simply between her and the Roman Catholic priesthood of Ireland. It is quite clear that, unless the bishops and clergy of that Church cordially approve of the measure, it must fail, however liberally and profusely the Government may rain down upon them the golden shower. From all we have heard, or seen, or read of the spirit which now animates that body, we are convinced that they would reject the tempting offer—reject it, not because they are insensible to the merits of a permanent and respectable provision—not because they would repudiate the idea of the State entering once more into relations with their Church—but because they clearly see that the method the State would adopt, were she to follow Lord Alvanley’s advice, could only render their position one of degradation, and lower them in the eyes of their flocks and the estimation of all men, by converting them

sure still is, content to lean for support on political Presbyterianism, and thus to give up her vantage ground of antiquity and apostolicity to her schismatical Roman sister. We are glad, however, to learn, from a pamphlet which has appeared since the greater part of this article was written, that “many of the (Irish) clergy are, thanks to Oxford, less Calvinistic, less fierce, but more staunch as to Roman error—more ready to own the Romish Church as a sister, though a fallen one—more apt to pray for than to curse the Jerusalem of Christendom.”—*Ireland: her Church and her People. By a Tory. Painter, Strand. p. 80.*

into a class never much respected, and nowadays regarded with especial ill favour—a class of State pensioners.

“No (say the most high-minded and respected among the Irish Roman Catholic hierarchy); if the State does indeed think it right and expedient that we and our religion should be more firmly attached to her than she conceives we are at present, let her not fancy that a miserable pittance, doled out with a sparing hand and upturned eyes, and with many protestations and expressions of regret, will be acceptable to, or accepted by us; let her not delude herself with the vain notion that an annual stipend will seal the indignant mouths of our preachers, or bribe us to a latitudinarian acquiescence in the will of a government. True it is that our priests are ill paid—are, in many instances, dependent for support on men who barely know how to support themselves, and are oftentimes unable to dispense that charity to others which they themselves almost stand in need of: still is our system most primitive and perfect—unshackled by all unworthy restraints and influences are the appointments and translations of our bishops—uncontrolled by civil interference are their spiritual duties and decisions; and shall we barter these inestimable privileges away for a few handfuls of State gold? No! if the State is sincere in her intentions, let her offer to us half those tithes of which we are now unjustly deprived, and leave us in full possession of those rights which she has never been able to take away.”

We speak with confidence when we say that such is the well nigh unanimous feeling among the Irish Roman Catholic ecclesiastics with regard to Lord Alvanley's proposition, and that therefore, all other considerations apart, it is vain and utopian. Lord Alvanley, in noticing the objections with which his plan might be met, seems to imagine that if the Irish Roman Catholic clergy were to oppose it, their opposition could only arise from bad motives:—

“I cannot believe that such would be the case; for though I have described the Irish priest as a political partizan, exercising, through his spiritual and temporal power, an undue influence over his flock, I did not mean to say that such a character was universal through the country, or to doubt that amongst the priesthood might be found numbers of excellent men, who.....would infinitely prefer receiving at the hand of Government a regularly paid and sufficient stipend, to the more irksome process of obtaining one, as they do now, by solicitations or threats.”

We have said enough above to show that we give that priesthood credit, in many cases, for worthier motives of opposition than those which may be derived from a dread of losing electioneering power, or the means of tyrannizing over the domestic concerns of their flocks: but it may be that these less Christian reasons may mingle their earthly alloy with the purer ones we have spoken of; if so, that only renders our position stronger, and fortifies us in our conviction that the Irish priesthood would refuse, were it offered, a salaried support from the State. Is, then, the unhappy peasant still to continue paying for the sup-

port of two Churches? Is he still to be obliged to pay for the accustomed consolations and sacraments of his Church, and the sometimes arbitrary demands of the priests? Are we content to negative a proposal which would relieve him from this burden, and point out no other way ourselves? That would be unwise as well as unjust; and we are prepared, at the risk of raising a smile at the apparent simplicity of our scheme, to say to Sir Robert Peel's Government, if you wish to do real justice to Ireland, to conciliate her priesthood, and at the same time to regard the rights and wishes of the members of the Established Church—repeal, or at least greatly modify, the uncatholic statutes of mortmain—brush away from the walls of the Four Courts those captious and perversely ingenious cobwebs in whose musty folds the purest and noblest species of charity is entrapped and killed—and allow the rich and affluent to dedicate, of their broad lands and large possessions, somewhat to the honour of God and the service of his Church! Do this, and you will not long be vexed with angry discussions as to the unhappy grant to Maynooth, nor be called upon to take into your pay the clergy of a Church which you feel to be in error.

Time and space would fail us were we to sum up the evils that have resulted from those unchristian restrictions on the fairest works that adorn a Christian life—restrictions unaccompanied, that we are aware of, with any real advantages to the nation. Let any one, who conceives that they form a part of the great and simple system handed down to us from our Saxon ancestors, but turn to the debates of the Houses of Parliament in 1736, and be there convinced of the hollowness and fallaciousness of the arguments which prevailed upon the Legislature of that day to consent to the enactment of that statute, against which we more particularly protest, in the teeth of the unanimous voices of both Universities and all the charitable institutions of the country. Well had it been for Ireland if she had been free from these degrading laws—if the rich among her Roman Catholic children had been permitted to provide for the spiritual wants of their poorer brethren; and well it may yet be for her if a more discerning and enlightened policy even now removes the artificial embankments that have hitherto but too successfully obstructed the stream of charity and devotion. Let Sir Robert Peel take this fair and just step, and we have high Roman Catholic authority for assuring him, that in so doing he will more consult the wishes of the Irish priesthood than by doubling the grant to Maynooth, or rendering them the paid servants of the State.

With Lord Alvanley's next proposition we entirely and heartily

concur: it is the appointment of a minister to the Court of Rome. We speak here of diplomatic, not religious relations: for all the froth uttered from time to time in Exeter Hall will not make the Pope one whit the less the sovereign of Rome, or prevail on one Englishman to give up his visit of curiosity to, or his commercial connections with, the city of the Cæsars:—

“The next step (says his lordship) to be taken towards the realization of the great object in view ought to be the repeal of the enactments forbidding open communication with the Court of Rome, and the appointment of a minister to that Court, after the example of Russia and Prussia; thereby placing our relations with it, which are now contrary to every principle of sound reason and policy, on a statesmanlike and tangible footing.”

In the stormy times of Queen Elizabeth, when Rome had summoned forth her vassal crusaders, and directed the military strength of Catholic Europe against this one small island—when she, recovering from the consternation which the first shock of the Reformation had occasioned, breathed nothing but vengeance against our fearless princess, and, with a spirit worthy of the palmyest days of her power, denounced excommunication and annihilation upon the church, monarch, and people of these realms—then, indeed, amid the shock of nations, and marvels fitted for a giant’s nerve, the cry of “*Delenda est Anglia*” might well by our lion-hearted Queen be met with “*No peace with Rome!*” Each Englishman, be he never so Catholic at heart, must look back with proud delight to the bold isolation behind which England then retreated, and during which, be it never forgotten, her Roman Catholic children were often in the foremost ranks of her defenders. Had not the timid mind of James I. been (naturally enough, it must be owned) alarmed by the wretched attempt on the 5th of November, we have as little doubt but that he would have re-opened diplomatic relations with Rome, as that she would have willingly withdrawn from the mortifying, because exaggerated, position she had assumed during the late reign. In the offer of a cardinal’s hat to Archbishop Laud, we see how earnestly a reconciliation was sought for, and a tacit recognition of the validity of our orders; and if, in James II.’s time, the Pontiff showed no great anxiety to receive Lord Castlemaine’s homage, the reason of his reluctance may clearly be seen in the quickly following overthrow of King James, together with all his favourite schemes. During the succeeding reigns, up to the death of the last of the Stuarts, Rome might have been regarded in a somewhat similar light as in Elizabeth’s reign; and the same political reasons, though in an infinitely minor degree, obtained to forbid all friendly communications between the two courts. If the fears and prejudices

of the people were to be excited in order to deter them from following the standard of chivalrous Prince Charlie, he must be represented as falling a suppliant at the Papal toe, and joining in the anathema fulminated from the Vatican against the island of heretics.* Poetry, painting, oratory, loyalty to the reigning family, religion herself, were all brought to bear against acknowledging the Pope to be either a Christian or a Sovereign; and it needed the French revolution, with its “*Eveques à la lanterne*,” and Napoleon, with his cruel conduct to the venerable Pius VII., to disabuse the English mind of some at least of its anti-Roman prejudices, and to convince our statesmen that the torrent to be dreaded and guarded against by them will spring from other banks than those of the Tiber, whose feeble waters they had just seen so fearfully hurled back, till they seemed to threaten destruction to St. Angelo’s and St. Peter’s itself.† We are at a loss to understand why, after the prowess of our soldiers and the unconquerable determination of our people had restored, among the rest of the deposed sovereigns, the aged Pontiff to the desecrated Vatican, our rulers neglected that golden opportunity of renewing *diplomatic* connections with the Court of Rome, and quietly shrunk back into their old position of negative hostility, as if they were already half ashamed of having helped to drive French liberality and atheism from the precincts of the eternal city. We fear, however, that, in spite of all precautions (if it is still true, that any one holding official communication with Rome is subject to the penalties of a *præmunire*), that hardly had the Pope recovered his throne ere no less exalted and official a person than the late Lord William Bentinck was commanded by our Government to incur those penalties, and enter into communications, and those too of a friendly nature, with his Holiness;‡ and we must confess, that we gazed on Lawrence’s elaborated portrait of George IV. in its solitary chamber at St. Giovanni Laterano with not more of admiration than of surprise:—

* “To Rome then must the royal wanderer go,
And fall a suppliant at the Papal toe?
Shall he in robes on stated days appear,
And English heretics curse once a year?
Garnet and Faux shall he with prayers invoke,
And beg that Smithfield’s piles once more may smoke?
Forbid it, Heaven! My soul, to fury wrought,
Turns almost Hanoverian at the thought!”

Tickel’s Epistle to a Gentleman at Avignon.

† Vidimus flavum Tiberim retortum, &c.

‡ Directly after the evacuation of Genoa, where his lordship was in command of the British forces.

“The thing we know, though rich, is no ways rare,
But wonder how the d——l it got THERE.”

without, at least, subjecting him who conveyed it to the penalties of the law: nor are we quite satisfied that the luckless wights who assisted in receiving and unpacking the portrait of the Pope, that now shines in the galaxy of anti-Gallican heroes and sages in the gallery at Windsor, might not be proceeded against under the 13th Eliz., c. 2:—

“If any person shall bring into the realm any token or thing called by the name *agnus Dei*, or any crosses, *pictures*, beads, or such like vain and superstitious thing, from the bishop or see of Rome,” &c.

Who is ignorant of Canning's famous exposition of the difficulty he discovered himself to be placed in, by the gratitude evinced by the Pope for his conduct on the Roman Catholic question? Need we relate here how counsel learned in the law advised him, that by returning the answer which even the amenities of every-day life demanded, he would incur a *præmunire*, and how in consequence the air of St. Stephen's was compelled to waft his graceful acknowledgments to the chair of St. Peter's? All this is known, and is matter of history; but we believe it is not so generally understood that Lord Palmerston did, in the year 1833, yet further add to the number of his official iniquities, by holding, through the make-believe intervention of Sir Hector Gregg, communications, relating to spiritual and temporal affairs in the island of Corfu, with the Bishop of Rome. We give publicity to this alarming fact in order that, should, at any future period, Mr. Urquhart succeed in prevailing upon a constituency to return him to Parliament, he may confound the guilty ex-secretary by proving him to have dallied, not only with Russia, but also with Rome; and, unless we are much mistaken, the latter offence will, in the eyes of some estimable senators, appear to constitute the gravamen of the impeachment.

Of late years, indeed, so great and sensible have proved the inconveniences arising from this strange policy, so galling to our own countrymen, and so troublesome to the foreign ministers have been its requirements, that, by an underhand sort of legerdemain, an English consul has been established at Rome, by whom passports can be signed, and various other minor consular affairs transacted: but we believe that Mr. Freeborn exercises his functions in virtue of an appointment as paid *attaché* to the embassy at Florence, and not as English consul at Rome; but whether this be so or not, can anything be more absurd than that we, who acknowledge the Sultan and the Shah of Persia, and who would send an embassy to-morrow to Sir Lionel Goldsmid, were he to buy for himself Jerusalem and Judea as a

kingdom, should still persist in refusing to entertain *diplomatic* relations with that Court, which (rightly or wrongly, matters not) is held by the majority of Christians, to be the centre of Catholic unity, and the fountain of Catholic Christianity? Well does Mr. Cochrane, in his able pamphlet, observe :—

“Now as the Roman Catholic religion is no phantasmagoria, but has a real and acknowledged existence, and the Pope is not only a spiritual, but a *temporal* sovereign, we are at a loss to discover the gross immorality of recognizing him in his latter capacity. British travellers are often subjected to much inconvenience from the circumstance of our having no representative at the Court of Rome ; while the many duties, which ought to be discharged by our own, devolve upon the Hanoverian minister. When other Protestant nations do not consider that they are betraying their faith in formally recognizing the existence of a religion which has endured from the earlier ages, our excessive sensitiveness and mawkish delicacy is rather an indication of sickness and lassitude in our Church, than of a strong and vigorous spirit, and can only be regarded as a remnant of bigotry, worthy of the darkest periods of the middle ages. Robertson, in alluding to the fears which were so long entertained of the house of Austria, remarks—‘Nations had been so often employed in guarding against it, that the dread of it became a kind of *political habit*, the influence of which remained when the causes which had formed it ceased to exist.’ An observation, which may be applied with equal truth to our extreme fear of Papal encroachments.”

“The spirit of advancement (says Lord Alvanley) which has been in progress during the last fifty years, the daily increasing application of the mighty instrument which has centupled the power of printing, almost annihilated distance, and by bringing the nations of the world, as it were, in contact with each other—has diffused mutual knowledge, promoted beneficial intercourse, and broken down the barriers of prejudice and ignorance—has been felt by the Church of Rome, as well as by every other institution in the civilized world ; and though the great principles on which that Church was founded are immutable, the anti-social dogmas which, during a long period of undisputed domination, had crept into and defaced it, have become obsolete, and enlightened men have modelled its doctrines, and particularly those which apply to persons professing another form of worship, in a spirit more accordant to the age in which we live.”

There is a *practical* truth in this, though were the Papal Court once more in the position in which Gregory VII. and Boniface VIII. placed it, we fear that the “more accordant spirit” here spoken of would be difficult to see. But Lord Alvanley shall go on :—

“The relations existing with Russia, Prussia, and other Greek and Protestant States, are the best proof that such is the case ; and it is certain that the Pope, and the most distinguished and influential Catholics, anxiously desire that similar relations should be established with this country, and are prepared to meet any advances made for such a purpose on our part, in a manner that cannot fail to be advantageous to both.”

His lordship then proceeds to state the good effects that would

result to Ireland, from subjecting the priests more directly to the discipline of Rome, and from placing the regulation of Maynooth in the hands of the Jesuits; into neither of which questions do we propose to enter.

We have thus endeavoured to give a sketch of this brochure, which has excited a good deal of attention, and our own unbiassed opinion of the plans it proposes. Let us now turn for a few minutes to Dr. Wiseman's Letter, which throws a religious light on the merely political picture we have just been contemplating. We would recommend every one who reads Lord Alvanley's pamphlet to follow it up by this publication: the calm exposition of the practical views of the worldly statesman, and the glowing aspirations, perhaps equally practical, of the earnest Roman Churchman, mutually relieve each other, and in many cases strengthen each other's arguments. Thus while Lord Alvanley would renew an intercourse with the Court of Rome on the ground of worldly expediency, Dr. Wiseman urges upon our Government the duty of what he considers Catholic unity.

Perhaps we may be too sanguine if we entertain any large anticipation of the advances which Rome is beginning to make; if so, we shall be well content to have ante-dated her in that matter: but we are firmly persuaded that in Spain and in France, in Italy and in Ireland, a juster view of our claims, as a Church, is obtaining; and we know no greater pleasure than to collect and treasure up the various little intimations of love and goodwill which fall here and there, like the large, silent drops of summer rain, upon the parched and painful ground of angry controversy and unchristian recrimination. Yes! it may be too sanguine, but we cannot condemn those who imagine that in these, and in Dr. Wiseman's Letter especially, they see pledges of the ultimate reconciliation of Romanized Christendom to a purer Church and a happier nation—the first faint, quivering blush of the brightest morn that has dawned upon Europe for these three hundred years.

A remarkable corroboration of what we have just said, as to the growing sympathy of foreign Churches with our own, is to be found in a Letter, by an anonymous writer, to Mr. Palmer and Dr. Wiseman; who the writer is we know not, but he puts forth his statements with an air of conscious authority and knowledge, very unlike the generality of anonymous pamphleteers: he says—

“The most remarkable instance of things now taught and practised in the Church (of Rome), which are contrary to the instruction of Christ, and contrary to the instruction of the apostles, is the refusal to give to the laity the wine in the eucharist. To this may be added the carrying on of public worship in a language unknown to the people; the com-

elling of all priests, indiscriminately, to abjure marriage; and the forcing of all persons to be subject to any interrogatories, however disgusting and offensive to delicacy, which the priests please to put, under the pretext of perfect confession. A large body of the Roman Catholic clergy in Germany is now determined to put an end to these abuses, even at the risk of incurring much evil of a different kind; and this body is supported by many ecclesiastics in France and Italy. The above-mentioned abuses all relate to matters of discipline, and not of faith, and might be easily corrected, if the Sovereign Pontiff should be induced, by timely interference, to save the Church from the further evil of another schism.”*

In Ireland also,† unless we are misinformed, a similar leaven is at work, and all things tend to show how general, among Romanists, is the expectation that the time is near at hand when Rome will be content, in order, it may be, to enlarge her bounds, to loosen the pegs of her tent, and throw down those uncatholic barriers by which she has hitherto prevented us from approaching her as children of a sister Church. Whether these aspirations ever will be realized or not, is a question into which we do not now purpose to enter: at all events they are delightful, even if only delightful dreams.

Viewed in another light, the appointment of an English minister to the Court of Rome would be beneficial to the sacred cause of unity, in helping to dispel many false notions and prejudices that are now entertained to *our* disadvantage by even educated people in various Roman Catholic countries. The mere fact of our Sovereign having no representative at Rome is to the ignorant Italian a proof that England is not a Christian land: and it is deeply to be regretted that the conduct and language of numbers of our summer tourists and winter residents abroad do but tend to strengthen that conviction. Of course, as far as this part of the argument is concerned, everything would depend on the person selected. Let a man of sound Church principles, religious in his life, attentive to the various offices and ministrations of his Church, be placed at Rome, as the representative of England, and he would, humanly speaking, do more to set us right in the eyes of the Italians than all the publications of all the Tract Societies in London. But let us carry this pleasant vision a little further. There is already in the eternal city—thanks to the liberality of the Pontiff—a church wherein divine service is performed according to the use of the Church of England, that is to say, twice every Sunday, and on the greater Church festivals. Let us imagine (great as

* “Remarks on the Churches of Rome and England, respectfully addressed to the Right Rev. Dr. Wiseman and the Rev. William Palmer.”

† *Vide* the last three numbers of the “Dublin University Magazine.”

the stretch of the imagination is) our ambassador to go out on his mission, as ambassadors were wont to go while the Stuarts reigned, with two or three chaplains, and all the external evidences of their being members of a real branch of the Church Catholic; let us fancy these chaplains saying, as their Church bids them, their matins and even-song in the holy temple, observing the weekly fasts, and celebrating weekly the eucharist; let us also picture the ambassador, instead of rejoicing at escaping from the thralldom which habit and decency had imposed on him in England, humbly and reverently performing his religious duties, as his obedience to the Church commanded, while the doors of the temple itself should stand open all day and reveal to the eye of the devout Italian something fairer than a matted floor and a patent stove—some signs and symbols of the faith we profess other than chairs and pulpit; let us, we say, conceive a state of things like this, and the idle and profligate, who now dishonour our nation and religion in the most awful of cities, will be shamed into decency, and our Church will appear robed far more in the beauty of holiness than she has hitherto appeared before the eyes of the people and the Church of Rome. Nor, on the other hand, should we fail to be gainers from a representative of our nation being in constant communication with the Pope and the Cardinals: through him juster notions of Roman rites, and ceremonies, and religious habits, would be conveyed to the Government at home, and our statesmen would learn to appreciate, more than they do now, the various media through which nations of various origins and temperaments may approach their common Father without departing from the rule of faith. Let us not be misunderstood; we are no advocates of Popery—we are neither papists nor *semi-papists*; we are not pleading in behalf of the grosser forms of Italian superstition, as they would and must be viewed by Englishmen; but we would point out the possibility, at any rate, of an act, which in an Englishman would be superstitious, in an Italian being reverential. It is well remarked by the able writer to whom we have before referred that—

“The Scotch and Germans are superstitious, but their superstition is not through faith in relics or saints, but in all kinds of imaginary beings in an imaginary world. In Spain and Italy it is rashly concluded that the idolatry of the people has been inculcated by the Spanish and Italian priests, because the belief of the vulgar rests on silly legends about pious Christian people; and that it has not been inculcated by German priests, because the heroes of the Brochen and of the Geistvelt have not been fathers and martyrs in the Christian Church.”*

* Letter to Dr. Wiseman and Mr. Palmer, p. 6.

But and if this be too favourable a picture of the teaching of the Italian priests—if modern saints continue to be canonized at Rome, and the people are still taught to rely on their merits and intercession, is this a reason why we should refuse to permit our purer light to shine among them in an *authorized* and *official* manner? Nay, rather is not this an additional cause for unlocking those diplomatic gates which insular jealousy—caused, it is true, by Roman encroachments—has so long closed, and permitting the worshippers in Rome to see how they can be catholic without being idolatrous, and faithful yet not superstitious? The same Christian charity, then, that even now is sending our missionary bishops to the uttermost parts of the earth, calls on us to send an ambassador such as we have described to Rome, and a blessing will surely go with him. True, he may have no difficult diplomatic questions to solve, no dark political intrigues to unravel; he may not have an opportunity of gaining fame in outwitting his colleagues or fomenting intestine divisions; but we may at least hope that, through the mercy of God, he may be an humble instrument in his hands for restoring unity to Christendom, and contending dissent and schism in England; and even if not, at least the attempt is a Christian one.

The theme is so exciting that we hardly dare trust ourselves to write more on it. What words can express the glory of that day which shall witness the termination of the Roman schism in this country, when with April tears of joy and contrition, and mutual confessions of pride, and hard-heartedness, and sin, brothers shall meet brothers, and sisters meet sisters, and kneel together before the altars of their mother Church? Oh, joyful day! oh, blessed sight! our eyes may not witness it—our ears may not hear the heartfelt songs of thanksgiving that shall herald it; but it is a promise of Scripture, and therefore we feel a certainty that it will come, and come even while the world, with its unbelief and its politics, its heedlessness and its scorn, is proclaiming the expectation of it to be a dream and a phantom, a shadow and a deceit.

Then, and then only, will the horrors of physical and religious destitution be fairly grappled with and conquered; when, uniting to the awful and apostolic simplicity of our Church the perfect machinery of Roman institutions, she shall in very deed be “all things to all men.”

“Arrayed in all her heavenly charms; majestic in the temple; devout at the altar; pure and sublime in the pulpit; moral and highly disciplined in the college; Christian and pious in the school; zealous and generous in the noble; edifying in the gentle; humble and resigned in the poor; charitable with wealth; cheerful and orderly with penury; chaste and honest in youth; holy and venerable in age; everywhere

reviving Catholic institutions, making peace and content to spring, as flowers beneath her tread, blessing and blessed in the happiness that she diffuses, and the compensations which she abundantly distributes.”*

Yes; far more efficacious—far more blessed and blessing in its results, would a return to catholic unity, on the part of those who are now schismatics, be, than the wisest of all the panaceas which the world-wisdom of our political legislators are now so busily employed in preparing. Compared to this what are fresh reform bills, votes of money to build *cheap* churches, ballot boxes, universal suffrage, or alteration of the corn laws? When will our statesmen be convinced of the futility of legislating for the head, while the heart is sick—of giving fresh power to the legs and arms, while the eye that should guide their movements is devoid of light? When will they practically understand that great truth—

“How small, of all that human hearts endure,
That part which laws or kings can cause or cure!”

But it will be said that we, so far from acting on our own principles as just laid down, have pressed for changes infinitely greater than those we have, by implication, condemned above—that we have suggested schemes involving a more important subversion of the present order of things than is dreamed of by many a Chartist. It may be so; but our proposition is not to make new laws—is not to add another volume to that fearful shelf which now scarce contains the statutes at large: we would merely undo some of the coils that now hamper and fetter the Church, and have produced, and are at this moment producing, grievous injury and detriment to the State. If, as most men will agree, that nation is best governed which is governed well by fewest laws, then they who endeavour to simplify our code by expunging from it laws which are not only not beneficial, but positively injurious in their operation, ought not to be regarded as crack-brained enthusiasts, or dangerous innovators; and we conceive that in advocating the repeal of the statute of mortmain, and the laws prohibiting *official* intercourse with Rome, we are advocating not only the cause of the poor and the sick, the uninstructed and the forlorn, but the cause of truth, virtue, and Christianity itself.

We understand that a distinguished member of the present Government has declared it to be their intention to act upon sound Church principles, and thus to justify the confidence which the great body of the clergy placed in them, by anticipation, at the last election. We rejoice to hear this—we rejoice

* Letter on Catholic Unity, p. 34.

to think that more just and religious relations will be established between Church and State than obtained during the blighting hour of Whig supremacy, because we are firmly convinced, that not only the stability of Sir Robert Peel's Government, but the welfare of this country, its peace at home and its glory abroad, depend mainly on his acting conscientiously on those principles, and proving himself to be a truthful Catholic Churchman. The time, and we humbly thank God for it—the time has gone by when the Church was viewed as a mere appendage to Toryism. The hour has come, or, if it yet delays awhile longer its advent, it is speedily coming, when the discontented voice of a nation will cry aloud, in the words of Mr. Carlyle, “Guide me—govern me! I am mad and miserable, and cannot guide myself!” * Against such an hour, whether it comes now, or fifty or one hundred years hence, it behoves the Christian rulers of this still Christian land to prepare—had they not, perhaps, better anticipate it? We have endeavoured, in this article, to point out what measures we believe would best further that end, and they are, a total repeal, or, if that should seem impolitic at present, a great modification of the statutes of mortmain, and of those prohibiting open *State* communication with the Court of Rome. These are specific, tangible measures, and measures on which the State has a perfect right to legislate immediately; while there are many questions where delay is advisable, and where the Government would be wrong in acting on its *own notions and responsibility*—questions such as involve the re-establishment of ancient Ecclesiastical Institutions, the creation of new Bishoprics, and plans of National Education :† here time must be given for the opinion of the Church and the Universities to be distinctly obtained, and, when obtained, to be fairly and fully received and acted upon. If Sir Robert Peel will lead, he may be sure that he will not lack followers. Let him, if he pleases, boldly carry out the principles of his favourite Relief Bill of 1829, but let him remember, at the same time, that there are other interests of far higher importance, both to the Irish and English Catholic and Roman Catholic, than those connected with merely secular politics, and that with those interests are wonderfully, we are bold to say providentially, interwoven the amelioration of the moral and physical ill-being of suffering millions in the three kingdoms; and that, however salutary reforms or well-directed

* “Chartism,” p. 52.

† These questions are specified because the mode in which they would be decided, whether for good or evil, would depend, if the Government legislated *without* such advice as we have referred to, solely upon the circumstance of there being a *religious* Ministry in office at the time.

enactments may rub down some of the inequalities and lessen some of the evils under which we are now labouring, nothing short of a complete and uncompromising adoption of Catholic Church principles will avail to Christianize the expanded and expanding empire of machinery and manufactures—to give to toil its just reward, and to hallow it with a Christian benediction—to enable the State to fulfil its high and holy duties—to bring all ranks and classes into a well-defined and loving subjection to the Church—to heal the sores and bind up the wounds of bleeding, distracted Ireland—and to render England, what she once was, the queen of the nations, the glory of Christendom, the island of the saints—stretching her roots down into the richest soil of antiquity, and spreading her fruitful branches into the measureless empyrean of unseen futurity.

- ART. IX.—*An Account of the Settlements of the New Zealand Company.* By the Hon. H. W. PETRE. London: Smith and Elder. 1841.
2. *New Zealand, South Australia, and New South Wales.* By R. S. JAMESON, Esq. London: Smith and Elder. 1841.
 3. *Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North West and Western Australia.* By GEORGE GREY, Esq., Governor of South Australia. London: Boone. 1841.
 4. *Western Australia: comprising a Description of the Vicinity of Australind.* By T. J. BUCKTON, Esq. London: Ollivier. 1840.
 5. *Hand-book of Emigrants: being a History of New Zealand.* By JOHN BRIGHT, Esq. London: Hooper. 1841.
 6. *New Zealand and the New Zealanders.* By ERNEST DIERFENBACK, M.D. London: Smith and Elder. 1841.
 7. *New Zealand in 1839; or, Four Letters to the Right Hon. Earl Durham.* By JOHN DUNMORE LANG, D.D. London: Smith and Elder. 1839.
 8. *The Present State, Resources, and Prospects of New Zealand.* By E. CAMPBELL. London: Smith and Elder. 1840.
 9. *Observations on the Climate of New Zealand.* By W. SWAINSON, Esq. London: Smith and Elder. 1840.
 10. *Reconnoitring Voyages and Travels, with Adventures in South Australia, &c. &c.* By W. H. LEIGH, Esq. Second edition. London: Smith and Elder. 1840.
 11. *An Address to the New Zealand Emigrants.* By the Rev. JAMES RUDGE, D.D. London: Painter. 1840.

12. *Reports and Dispatches of the Earl of Durham on British North America.* London: Ridgway. 1839.

WE believe it to be the glorious destiny of England to plant the banner of Christ upon bare and desolate wastes, and to cover barren lands with the smiling industry of civilized life. With this feeling we have always looked favourably upon commerce, as being the pioneer of civilization, and the precursor of Christianity. When we add to the powerful inducements of trade the mighty energy of steam, wafting thousands from shore to shore, with a precision and speed perfectly marvellous, combining the comforts of life with the excitements of fresh action and scenery, and bringing the highest skill to diminish the perils of the ocean—we think that these are sufficient to justify our faith, that, under a well organized and comprehensive system, conducted on a national scale, we are destined to spread the blessings of civilization over the wide deserts and thinly populated wastes, whose existence is now known only by a large space on the map. We are, therefore, glad to embrace every opportunity of calling the attention of our readers to the progress of COLONIZATION; nor are we insensible to the great benefit which a too densely populated state derives from the emigration of some of its surplus members. We have always considered that the activity which is destructive to the social order of a too crowded state becomes a great fructifying power, when there is sufficient, and, if we may use the expression, innocent room for the exercise of its energies. We have little doubt but that the beginning of popular discontent may not unfrequently be crushed in the bud by a judicious system of colonization: we do not mean the disruption of parts—the sending of isolated members to perish on a desert land; but the transplanting of a well chosen assortment of individuals to commence operations on a new scene. They would thus have all the advantages of co-operation; whereas, under the old system (if system it can be called, which had impulse or discontent for its origin, with misery and death for its end), the chances were *altogether against them*. We may take this opportunity of expressing our dissent from a doctrine very prevalent—we mean *the natural life of a nation*. It has become a current opinion—a kind of proverb—that nations, like individuals, have their *rise and decline*, and that, in fact, *decay is the ultimate result of all national life*. That this has been the case in the pagan world is notorious, and we candidly admit it has occurred in nations comparatively modern; but we have a rooted conviction that Christianity is no less the life of a nation than of an individual,

and that it breathes into it an immortality which has hitherto not belonged to nations. It is evident that when war was the foundation and support of a state the time would inevitably occur when some younger arm would conquer the old and veteran state, and that a moral retribution would as certainly fall upon the mass as upon the individual ; but the amazing spread of real practical Christianity, of late years, has entirely changed the aspect of the political world, and created *a kind of conscience among nations*, which will, we are confident, in time, destroy the *principle of physical force* ; these times, we are assured by numerous prophecies in the holy Scriptures, are to come—the united strength of the whole human race cannot stop the advent of the kingdom of Christ upon earth ; and we may call, as an evidence of the coming millennium, the gratifying fact, that the last quarter of a century has passed over without a war, when very many irritating causes have existed between European nations to embroil them in one. We more especially allude to the position which France and England so lately occupied, fully prepared for conflict—armies and navies equipped—a mercenary and blood-thirsty press goading two brave and excited nations—and yet the wholesome fear of the awful responsibility that would fall on the first belligerents stayed the “blood hounds,” and completed the gentle triumph of peace.

We have to apologize for this digression, but we think the subject so full of interest, in this point of view, that we trust our readers will bear with us a little longer. The humanizing influence of Christianity, introduced through its useful pioneer—commerce—has only of late been felt as a *reality*. We have, indeed, for centuries had philanthropists starting up amongst us, and by their devotion and eloquence leavening the mass ; but still, whenever a nation’s vengeance, pride, or aggrandizement, has been appealed to, the result has always been *war*. The present generation, however, presents the brighter spectacle of *millions* feeling this solemn responsibility, and compelling their governments to lay the cause of dispute before the good sense and humanity of our common nature. We return, however, to the subject of our article.

We have stated that colonization is one of the simplest and readiest methods by which an overpeopled state may relieve itself of its burthen, and prepare uncultivated lands for future supplies. The foundation of empires thus laid ought to be conducted on a sound religious principle. The colonists ought not to be left “without God in the world”—the machinery (so far as it is possible) ought to accompany them : they ought not to go forth as savages to a savage land, but should carry the bless-

ings of civilization with them : their cause ought not to retrograde, even though for a time it must be stationary. It is obvious that *emigration* is a desolate, precarious expedient : *colonization*, on an enlightened *national* scale, is a legitimate effort of a great country to relieve itself, without sacrificing the colonists : the *one* takes out a few individuals to perish ; the *other* transplants an organized society—a tree that will bear fruit in season, not a miserable branch that will have to wait years for a blossom. The colonists begin with the advantages of the old world, divested of many of its burthens. If they have some hardships to endure at first, surely it is better than the sickening struggles for employment so common in England : they at least escape the painful conviction, that *their* being in *work* throws others *out* of work.

We are no great admirers of Mr. Wakefield, either as a man or as a politician ; but that will not prevent our doing full justice to his system of colonization : we have always considered it to include more of the philosophy of that subject than any other hitherto propounded. He is also an acute and intelligent observer ; and although his opinions are too frequently deformed by his Radical tendencies, we yet recognize much truth in their description, and sagacity in their application. We rejoice to think that he is devoting the energies of his vigorous mind to a subject of such paramount importance.

Of the capabilities of England to perform her great colonial mission no doubt can exist ; her wealth, her commerce, her activity, her boundless possessions, her immense fleets, the skill of her mariners, and her ambition, are notorious to the world : and when we look at her densely populated condition—the millions of unemployed capital demanding a field for its exercise—the miraculous powers of her machinery, diminishing, to a great extent, the demand for manual labour—the vehemence of her political parties—the perilous freedom of her press—we think these are sufficient to urge upon the philanthropist, the merchant, the statesman, and the Christian, the necessity of providing against the contingencies which such a chaotic mass may generate. It is also evident that these elements are those which are most calculated to make England the grand colonizer of the world. How unfit the French are for this great and onerous task is apparent from her invariable failures ; and we, therefore, think the duty becomes the more imperiously urged upon us ; but even if we decline from *principle*, or dissent from *theory*, the progression of population compels, and we must submit. It is, therefore, not left to our option ; and we are bound, by the most solemn of obligations, to render the system as complete as we

possibly can : nor should we forget that it will, like virtue, bring its own reward. To found a colony is to create a market for the production of our industry, and even on this solitary ground highly desirable. During the last forty years the population of England has nearly doubled its number ; and that part of the United Kingdom, which in 1801 contained only 8,331,434 individuals, now amounts to 14,995,508 ; or, including Wales, 15,906,829 ; in fact, nearly 16,000,000 of human beings. The entire population of Great Britain, which in 1801 was 10,472,048, now amounts to 18,664,761, without including the present population of Ireland. Of this great and regularly increasing population we shall show that a very large proportion are continually in a state of severe privation, and which, at times like the present, amounts to a frightful and scarcely conceivable destitution.

We shall not quote from the daily papers as to the amount of distress now existing ; we believe that it is acknowledged by all. From the crowded state of *our country*, now let us turn to the lands demanding cultivation. A map is before us of Western Australia : throughout an extent of country equal to all England and France there are to be seen, instead of the names of cities and towns, the following descriptive notices : “ Open plains, with rich soil and grass ; ” “ Wooded hills ; ” “ Level plains covered with grass, the soil a good brown loam ; ” “ Murray river, bordered by a mahogany forest ; ” “ Large valleys ; ” “ Pasture land, with lakes.” Surely these are significant hints as to where our surplus population ought to go. “ Here is ample room and verge enough.” In England human labour cries out for land to till : in our colonies the answer is to be found ! They who remain and those who go are alike benefitted ; the state breathes easier for the loss of its surplus inhabitants. It is, therefore, our bounden duty to render to the emigrants all the comforts and facilities in our power. We should be careful that our system is founded on just and humane principles ; we should never for an instant forget that it ought to be under the recognition of *Church and State* ; we should remember that we are parting with our fathers, brothers, friends, and children—that they have immortal souls—that they have as fair a claim to remain in their native land as we have ; we should feel bound by all the “ ties of humanity ” to soften the pangs they must inevitably feel in parting for ever with old and hallowed associations. We do not think this has been sufficiently considered : there is too much apathy shown to the receding vessel, with its sad hearts, compelled by a variety of causes to leave their native homes. As the shores fade in the distance we can well understand how many a fellow-creature on the deck must feel his old remembered

parish church : his fathers' tombs, full in his memory's eye, rise on his heart—the divine old Psalm tunes, with his mother's voice, dwelling like a charm on his ear—the fields he trod in youth—the first companions he knew, and doubtless the only ones he ever thoroughly loved—all these, with the ten thousand haunting recollections which fall on an absent heart, like the dew of a beautiful and sad regret, more terrible than grief, must swallow the heart up with its sorrow ! We would, therefore, earnestly pray our readers to ponder these things, and believe that the subject of our present article is one of absorbing interest, and fraught with the most important results to thousands of our fellow-creatures.

We shall not relate the miserable failure of Swan River ; we shall merely advert to it as a striking instance of the necessity of some national plan. It is painful to reflect how many valuable lives have been sacrificed to the rash schemes of speculators and the self-will of obstinate persons, leaving out altogether the treasures swallowed up in these ill-planned experiments. We are no lovers of *gold, as gold* ; but, when we recollect what a silent energy for good dwells in it, we are not afraid to confess that we look upon the waste of treasure as a calamity—its comparative nothingness to the priceless value of human life does not prove its worthlessness. If gold corrupts the statesman and betrays innocence, it relieves distress and wafts the glad tidings of Christ to thirsty and benighted souls. Its judicious application is, therefore, of no little importance ; and we should rejoice to see some of the millions hitherto expended in war now devoted to the spread of civilization. We have cheerfully contributed to the establishment of our national glory and defence ; now let us bestow some for the purposes of peace. We are convinced that even a tax, laid on, *were it necessary*, for the establishment and support of a system which would confer such blessings on his native land, would be cheerfully paid by every Englishman.

We have only to point to the head of this article to evidence the attention which emigration is now receiving from the public mind. We do not wish Government to do everything for the people, but we maintain that *these* proceedings ought to be under its control. We know of no firmer basis for the prosperity of a new colony than a sound religious head accompanying the settlers. Government ought undoubtedly to appoint clergymen of discretion and reputation to watch over the spiritual welfare of the infant state. We would as soon trust a child of three years old to run about a town full of gypsies and kidnappers, as send a thousand or a hundred of our fellow-creatures to found a new colony. Why the inevitable result would be the

establishment of a horde of pirates ; by degrees their very humanity would leave them, and in the lapse of ages their descendants would be savages, and possibly considered by some future discoverer as the miserable aborigines of barbarism. We may as well here notice the pleasing fact, that Mr. Petre (whose pamphlet is among those at the head of this review), although a Roman Catholic, has yet cordially approved of the appointment of the Bishop of New Zealand. The two great colonial establishments of Australind and New Zealand owe almost entirely their existence to the enterprize and capital of a few British merchants. It is gratifying to find such sound practical men as Messrs. Chapman, Baring, Jones, Brooking, &c., forgetting for a season their individual pursuits, and devoting a share of their time and wealth to these great objects. They truly realize the magnificent line of Dryden—

“Their merchants princes, and each deck a throne.”

Although the character and respectability of these great merchants are sound pledges of the safety with which the public may receive their statements, we yet retain our opinion, that Government *ought to be the responsible colonizer* ; and we hope some arrangements will be made by which these merchants, who have embarked their wealth in these pioneer experiments, will be ensured in the protection of their interests, and yet placed under the necessary control of Government.

We shall now call the attention of our readers to the colonies of Australia—an immense tract of fine rich land, blessed with a climate of surpassing beauty and healthfulness, and placed in the position that ensures a large interchange of communication with India : and we may here advert to the wide range for thought and speculation which the proximity of Australia to India opens to the mind. The oldest and the newest portions of the globe are on the eve of being brought into contact. Let us bend our gaze on India, with its solemn and mysterious temples and pagodas—its awful tribe of deformities, occupying the shrine of God—its ancient learning, half hidden by its very antiquity, like ruins obscured by ivy—its glaring tigers and colossal elephants—its serpents and sacred beetles—its towers of trees—its densely crowded and enslaved population—its mixed European and Asiatic luxuries—its gold, gems, and mighty shower of barbaric splendours. From this dazzling scene let us turn our gaze to the empty, grassy plains of Australia—the broad, far-ranging, green immensities of its undulating surface ; its silent and lofty mahogany forests and nations of harmless kangaroos ; its few isolated savages, herding like beasts together, without laws or “God in the world”—the poor, staring, lank-

haired, raw material of humanity, wandering over mighty and voiceless solitudes, and presenting a scene as truly in the beginning of things as though the world had been created in a savage animal state, with the discovery of those remote shores. It is impossible to calculate upon the results of this sudden introduction to each other: we can only wait for the solution. We may, however, just notice, incidentally, the great physical advantage to be derived by the sallow, jaundiced, liver-destroyed East Indian rusticating for a few months at one of the Australian settlements, the passage to which being only three weeks, would soon prevent the necessity of a voyage to England.

To return to the more immediate subject of our article. South Australia was colonized as lately as the year 1836, and in the short space of four years abundant harvests are springing up to reward its first settlers. In the capital, Adelaide, seven hundred or eight hundred houses have been built, many of handsome appearance; and a college, churches, chapels, markets, and banks, give an earnest of its soon becoming a great city. Newspapers have for some time been published, and an exchange established: thus administering to the various wants of a population of six thousand inhabitants. The exports of the last year were considerable, and the revenue from the Customs alone amounted to 30,000*l.* per annum. The sale of land is very considerable, yielding, in 1839, a sum little short of 200,000*l.* The total amount of population in this flourishing colony is now estimated at fifteen thousand souls. It was in South Australia that colonization was first made on true principles, viz., that the produce of the sales of land should be applied in conveying suitable persons, of both sexes, and in equal proportions, to the colony supplying the funds; and the great success of the experiment has borne out the soundness of the principle. And we are glad to find that it is in the contemplation of Government to apply the above principle to the settlement of Western Australia, which for ten years has been languishing in an unprogressive existence, while its sister colony, in so short a space, has left it far behind: thus showing the absolute necessity of starting upon correct principles. We only add, *let there be reserves for CHURCH PURPOSES.* We observe, in the formation of the Western Australian Company, the names of many influential merchants and capitalists, who have invested a large amount of capital in the purchase and re-sale of land, on the pledge of her Majesty's Government to apply the same principles of colonization to this as to the colony of South Australia. It is also very essential to remark, that no convicts are to be sent to these colonies. The large territory acquired by the Western Austra-

lian Company extends from the river Arrowsmith and Ganthiaume Bay, differing from the site first fixed upon; but circumstances much to their advantage have induced this change. This Company has also, by a special grant from the Colonial Office, the privilege of selecting its land in separate blocks, of 30,000 acres each: thus avoiding poor and sterile tracts, and securing to the colonist a greater proportion of rich and fertile soil than is usual in most settlements. We must also notice another advantage, and one of great importance, arising from this new system. A surveying staff is, in the first place, dispatched, to prepare the way and to make choice of the most desirable positions: and thus the colonist, when he lands, has not to wait in expensive and demoralizing idleness, but is at once enabled to choose his location, and apply his fresh energy in a situation the best adapted for its development.

We now turn our attention to the thriving and important colony of New Zealand.

The three beautiful islands which compose New Zealand are computed to contain 50,000,000 of square acres. The middle island, which is the largest of the three, and the southern, which is the smallest, are as yet little known, except on their coasts, and are thinly inhabited here and there by the tribes of the aborigines and a few isolated settlers employed in the whale fishery; but there is every reason to believe that they are rich and fertile in a high degree. Their coasts contain many fine harbours, enclosed by mountains, which slope, as they recede inland, into a succession of hills, clothed with verdure and timber to their summits, and abounding in excellent water. On the northern island the New Zealand Company has already founded two colonies, and are about to found a third. A sufficient extent of the island has been explored to render its character no longer doubtful, and to establish the certainty of its richness and beauty. Near the coast it is generally mountainous, but the mountains are clothed with the richest verdure to their summits, which are generally flat, with a rich soil, and capable of cultivation, as well as their sloping sides. In the interior the country is sometimes hilly, the hills being covered with fine timber; and sometimes it presents the appearance of an undulating plain, bearing a rich vegetation, generally consisting of tall fern and myrtle, which only requires to be burnt, in order to fit the land for the plough. At other places the prevailing vegetable production is the valuable flax plant, or *phormium tenax*, and natural grasses. There are multitudes of streams and many rivers, some of which are navigable for vessels of small draught; and the harbours have long been cele-

brated. The climate is singularly salubrious, the temperature equable, and by some of the settlers compared to that of Madeira, the latitude being between 34° and 42° south. The climate of Australia has also been found eminently conducive to health and life.

But the catalogue of wide fields spread out by nature in these regions is not even yet exhausted. Over the Polynesian Archipelago, from the latitude of Norfolk Island, in 30° south, to that of the Sandwich Islands, in 20° north, a distance of three thousand miles, there reigns a perpetual summer, tempered, even in the equatorial regions, by those alternations of land and sea breezes, which are as regular in their recurrence as the rising and setting of the sun. We might suppose, with Mr. Jameson, that the poet must have dreamed of Polynesia, and its thousand isles, when he penned the following lines to the "southern wind:"—

"Long hast thou lingered midst those islands fair,
Which lie like jewels in the Indian deep,
'Mid green waves all asleep,
Fed by the summer suns and azure air."

"Nature has formed this insular region for the culture or spontaneous growth of the rarest and richest productions of the earth. The sugar of Otaheite is equal to that of the Mauritius; the banana and the cocoa palm flourish throughout these islands as luxuriantly as in Java, and the cultivated productions of Norfolk Island are similar to those of Madeira. In short, spices, coffee, sugar, silk, and cotton, are as capable of successful culture in the Marquesas, the Fejees, or New Caledonia, as in the Malaccas, Java, or the West Indies. * * * *

"When we contemplate these boundless fields, that are accessible to the labouring community of England, and the infinite opportunities which the colonization of these regions presents for the lucrative and beneficial employment of capital, we reflect, with amazement and sorrow, that at this very moment national destitution is preying, like a vulture, upon the health and morals of the British population."—*Jameson's New Zealand, South Australia, &c.*, p. 102.

We regret that we cannot advert more at length to the volumes at the head of our notice. We must content ourselves by observing, that all who contemplate an emigration to "these wonderful new worlds" will find them instructive: to the Christian, anything that concerns the welfare of our fellow-creatures must ever be interesting. There is another very grateful fact connected with modern colonization: formerly the unhappy aborigines were hunted down as wild animals, but now Christianity has interposed its divine arm, and arrested the thoughtless hand of the settler, and there is every reason to expect the probability of their being converted into civilized beings. That this will be the case we see no reason to doubt: of course the change cannot be worked in an

instant ; it must be gradually done, by showing them kindness—by administering to their wants—by teaching them to feel a confidence in us—by extending the hand of fellowship, and not by pointing the musket : let there be an *earnest* desire on *our* part to receive them into the Catholic Church, and we cannot doubt but that God will, in his own good time, bring them into the fold of that Shepherd who careth for all. It will be understood that we do not recommend a blind and hazardous repose upon the harmlessness of their nature ; we would earnestly advise that every caution should be used in our intercourse with them. Like all savages, they have acute perceptions ; and no doubt exists that they may be employed successfully in many of the simplest operations of industry. Some have already been engaged as postmen, and some in labouring on the roads ; and from the various accounts we have received, they are not so degraded a race as many have imagined. And although their hereditary law of retaliation causes them to brood over an injury, and watch patiently for an opportunity of revenge ; still, as the individuals composing each tribe are continually at variance, it renders them quite unable to act in concert, and therefore but little danger is to be apprehended from them by civilized men. How loudly, then, does their condition call for the aid of sound knowledge and the blessings of true religion !

An increasing and fast spreading conviction, that colonization would avert some of the evils which are preying upon the people of Great Britain and Ireland, and considerably lessen others, is at this period observable in the public mind ; and a rumour gains ground, and we have reason to believe not without cause, that Government is about to propose a measure of national emigration on an extensive scale. Such a purpose would be hailed as one of the means towards a better state of things. A thorough co-operation of the Government, including, as it will, the Church Establishment of the mother country, would not fail to produce a feeling in favour of colonization, far more deep and general than has ever yet been experienced by the nation. That the majority should hitherto have regarded a departure from their native shores to reside in the colonies as something akin to exile ; that they should have feared the want of an organized system in the arrangement, not only of a proportion of capital and labour, but even of the immediate means of existence ; and that they should have dreaded the murderous incursions of the aborigines, as of equally brutalized men of whatever country, ready to take advantage of the non-existence of a sufficient military force, and of legal provision for the personal safety of a community and the protection of its property ; that these and other causes should have de-

tered thousands from seeking to better their condition in some of those beautiful countries we have been describing, cannot for one moment excite our wonder. But now that there is a prospect of finding themselves departing to a land where the mild and benevolent precepts of the Gospel will, on all sides, assure them that they are surrounded by a civilized and improving community; where the haunts of the blood-thirsty savage, with his club and spear, is gently superseded by the village church, and Peace walks forth where Murder once was king; where they can dwell under the civil protection of their own laws, as applied to the various relations of life and of commerce; and where they will find in general prevalence their own language, and all locally convenient old customs and habits—can any doubt exist of the rapid and extensive change in favour of colonization which will thus be effected in the minds of large masses of the people? They will no longer feel that they are going to a strange land, but to another home, where they will find more wealth, better health, more comfort, and more happiness.

Whatever theory may be adopted, as to the causes of present distress, it is certain that colonization would interfere with no plan of amelioration or reformatory change; and that to multitudes, who are suffering the privations and miseries to which we have alluded, it would be an unequivocal benefit. By its means paupers would be transformed into independent labourers, and starving communities transplanted into a land which only requires their labour to become a land of plenty. Were this all, it would be reason enough, and to spare, why such an intention of Government should be fostered and supported by the public at large; but it is *not* all. The emigrants who are conveyed to distant shores, under an enlightened system of colonization, will not only themselves be benefitted—they will lay the foundations of future empires, and prepare the way for human progression, where now only are trackless deserts and thinly peopled wastes haunted by savages, only a small portion of whom have even an idea of a God. Moreover, the beneficial reaction on the mother country can scarcely be estimated. Those who have been burdens in Great Britain will, by their settlement in the colonies, become the active producers of wealth, and consumers of the manufactures which the mother country will exchange for that wealth. Every colony that is founded on correct principles thus becomes a field for British capital and labour—an increase of British territory—so much land gained by the British people—so much wealth acquired by them. It is an auspicious circumstance that the leading opposition paper has come forward at the earliest opportunity to promise its support to the Government in case of

the rumour of their proposed measure on colonization proving well-founded:—

“We know not what ground there is for supposing that Government contemplates a large scheme of emigration; but if it does, it contemplates a most excellent thing, one in which we most heartily wish it success. No public purpose can be answered by thwarting it in such a plan: the intention, if it be but an intention, should be fostered; the measure, if measure have yet been prepared, should be vigorously supported.”—*Morning Chronicle*.

To those who have had their attention awakened to the subject, there are only three rational grounds of doubt or objection to an enlarged system of colonization. The first arises from uncertainty as to the means to provide for so great and expensive an undertaking, and the manifest evil of laying any additional burdens on our already over-burdened country. The second has been created by former errors in colonization, and an uncertainty as to the present state and prospects of the colonies. The third exists in the minds of benevolent individuals, rather than in the community at large: it arises from the horror with which they contemplate the past atrocities of so-called civilization towards the aboriginal inhabitants of the countries to which it has been carried by European nations, and the gradual extermination of these aboriginal races by the advancing march of this civilization. All these doubts and objections it becomes us seriously to consider.

It is eight years since Edward Gibbon Wakefield enunciated the true principles of colonization. These principles have been already carried into effect, to a considerable extent, by three great commercial associations—the South Australian, the Western Australian, and the New Zealand Companies; but it is still necessary to repeat them, for we still hear of objections raised on the score of expense to the mother country. At a meeting at the London Tavern, for instance, on the 13th of November last, a proposal was made by one speaker to move a resolution in favour of a national or parochial tax to promote emigration; and to this resolution other speakers very properly objected. It is necessary, therefore, to repeat Mr. Wakefield's principles:—

“That all unoccupied lands in the colonies being the property of the Crown, no person shall be allowed to obtain waste land therein, except by purchase of the Crown, in certain considerable quantities, and at an uniform price per acre, fixed sufficiently high to keep a continued supply of combinable labour in each colony, proportioned to the available capital invested therein.

“That the funds raised by the sale of lands in any colony shall be employed in conveying thither labourers from the United Kingdom who desire to emigrate, free from all expense to them: preference being given to young adult persons, especially if recently married; and care being taken to preserve equality of numbers of both sexes.”

In the *Colonial Gazette* of the 1st of December, Mr. Wakefield enlarged on this subject, and entered at full on the theory of colonization. We quote the following from this important document :—

“ The rumour of a project of emigration on a large scale has been so well received by the public, that I propose to confine myself to the consideration of *means* only. If this thing could be done by wishing, every Government would be ready to do it. Every Government is deterred from doing it, by a fear of adding to the public burdens. The idea of extensive emigration is still commonly associated with the idea of taxation for the purpose. And, indeed, when one thinks of emigration by itself—of the mere sending away of people—the next thought is inevitably about the cost of the process : and at this disagreeable point most people stop in reflecting on the subject. They stop here because they have not learned to regard emigration as but a part of something else. It is, in truth, only one of the elements of colonization. Viewed in this light, emigration appears to be susceptible of being carried on without any cost to the mother country. It is said that about forty thousand poor persons emigrated to our southern colonies during the past twelve-month. They could not pay for their own passage : the cost of their passage was not defrayed by any grant of Parliament : the whole expense of this great emigration is borne by the colonies, for which the accession of people is an increase of wealth out of all proportion larger than the expense of the passage. Do these colonies complain of having to pay for this great immigration of people? No ; they only ask for more lands on the same terms, knowing well, that just in proportion as they are supplied with labour will be their means of paying for its importation. Here, then, is the principle of a mode of carrying on emigration, which steers clear of the only objection to an extensive plan. The whole cost must be thrown on the colonies benefitted by the measure, and will be cheerfully defrayed by them. Such is the satisfactory conclusion drawn from viewing emigration as only a part of colonization.

“ It happens, in the next place, that the means, by which the colonies thus pay for emigration from the mother country, are not provided by colonial taxation, but arise, one may almost say spontaneously, as an incident of arrangements made with a view to colonial prosperity independently of immigration. The old plan of granting waste land for nothing was abandoned, because it was seen to operate as a check to the productiveness of colonial industry and the increase of colonial wealth. It produced this effect by causing the extent of appropriated land to be excessive, in proportion to population. In order to bring about a better proportion between land and people—one in which the colonists should be less dispersed, and labour for hire more available—it was found requisite to diminish the facilities of obtaining new land. And this, it soon became obvious, could be done in no way so easily, so fairly, and so efficiently, as by putting a ready-money price on all new land. The consequence was, a fresh source of public revenue for the colony—a fund that seemed to come by a sort of magic, as if for the purpose of enabling the colony to procure labour without taxing anybody. If the proceeds of the sales of land were turned into an immigration fund, the buyers of the land obtained for their money, not the land merely, but precisely that which was calculated to add most to its value—to make it cheap at the price which they had paid for it—namely, an increase of the

colonial population in exact proportion to their purchase-money. And the greater the immigration, the more land would be sold; the more land was sold, the greater would be the immigration. This system may be termed a colonizing machine worked by an inherent and continually growing power."—*Colonial Gazette*, Dec. 1, 1841.

It would be a work of supererogation to add anything to this clear exposition. The only thing needed is to afford an opportunity of observing the practical working of these principles, by describing the state and prospects of the colonies which have been founded on them; though even by these examples their due value cannot be sufficiently estimated, because in none of them have they been carried out to their full extent. All we say, in addition, is—ESTABLISH THE CHURCH.

South Australia was colonized as lately as the year 1836, by a chartered Company, which conveyed labourers thither free of expense, on the system of applying the fund raised by the sale of their lands to this all-important purpose. It was the first colony founded on Mr. Wakefield's principle. Its prosperity has been checked by local causes. It suffered materially at the outset from the slowness of the surveying department, and its credit has since received a shock through the large outlay of its first governor, Colonel Gawler. It has also sustained a season of severe drought, manifesting that it is subject to that great evil of Australia. Still the progress made in the short space of five years is astonishing. Accounts received up to the beginning of 1841 estimate the population at 15,000; and though it is probable that this number has since been diminished by secondary emigration to Van Diemen's Land, Port Philip, and New Zealand, owing to the various drawbacks we have enumerated, there can be no doubt that the colony will outgrow its difficulties, and increase and prosper. A kind of commercial crisis, occasioned by over speculation in land, over importation, and other causes, added to the original evils already detailed, is at present creating a panic among the colonists; but this in no way shakes our confidence. The circular from the mercantile firm in Adelaide, which is quoted in the *Times* of December 13th last, after detailing the difficulties prevailing there, concludes by saying, that "the writers anticipate with some confidence a better period, and, judging of the productiveness of the colony in wool and oil, expect that a time may shortly come when an increase of colonial produce will cause the balance of trade to be in favour of the colonists." In this anticipation all who are well informed on the resources of South Australia will concur. It is confidently stated that twelve thousand acres would be under cultivation in 1841, and that 1842 will see the colony independent of imported grain. The number of sheep at present de-

pasturing there is about two hundred and fifty thousand, requiring for their support one million of acres, and furnishing about half a million of pounds of wool, worth, in the English market, from 25,000*l.* to 30,000*l.* for the year's clip. The town of Adelaide, the capital of the colony, consists of about two thousand three hundred houses, nearly one half of which are of brick or stone, the rest being of wood. It contains eight churches and meeting-houses; has its mechanics' institute—its newspapers, clubs, hotels, and taverns; and sends home its cargoes of wool, which maintains its high character for quality, and, as in all the other Australian colonies, will long be the staple article of produce. Taken as a whole, South Australia is deficient in rivers, and this to such a degree as to prevent the exploration of its territory. The interior is yet unknown, no one having been able to penetrate more than forty miles inland, except on the banks of the Murray; while the sheep and cattle stations of New South Wales and Port Philip extend hundreds of miles inland. The Murray river, with its dependencies, however, waters a grand extent of fertile country, of which the district called the Mount Barker country is extremely rich. Little, however, can be said positively as to the capabilities of the region, because, out of its two hundred millions of acres, only a fraction, comparatively speaking, has yet been explored. Of "seven millions of acres" we can give an account, and these are, at all events, not to be despised. Mr. Jameson concludes an account of the nature of the soil by giving his opinion, that the immediate neighbourhood of Adelaide might well support three times its present population. There will be time enough, and to spare, therefore, for future exploration: meanwhile the colonists must learn to economize that precious element of water, which is their grand desideratum, by damming streams, and to distribute it by irrigation. The appearance of those portions of the country which have been explored is described as beautiful and park-like. The noble trees, being scattered at intervals, as though planted by the hand of art, spreading their fine branches widely—not crowded together in dense forests.

It is very problematical whether Adelaide will eventually continue to be the capital of the colony. The discovery of an eligible site for a town, which should possess the advantage of a fine harbour, such as Port Lincoln, for instance, would probably at once supersede it. Port Lincoln has no country in its vicinity eligible for pasturage; the Murray river, otherwise so fine a stream, is unfitted for becoming the medium of commerce. Such a fact as this is sufficient to show that the contingency we

have supposed is not unlikely to occur; but if it ever does, it will, of course, add to the general prosperity of the colony, though it may diminish the value of "town land" in Adelaide.

The Port Philip colony is coeval with South Australia, but has far outstripped it. This colony has the advantage of a fine harbour, offering ample shelter for shipping, and well situated as a commercial outport for the great range of pastoral territory, extending from the sea-coast to the Murray river, and from the banks of the Glenelg to the declivities of the Australian Alps.

The wreck of the steamer *Clonmel*, in 1840, on one of the dangerous reefs in Bass's Straits, led to the discovery of an important harbour and inlet between Port Philip and the south-east corner of New Holland, which was subsequently found to be the mouth of a fine river, since named the Clarence.

All this is still a land of promise. What Mr. Jameson means by his doubts as to wool-growing, lest the wool should degenerate into coarse hair, it is impossible to conjecture. The pastures of New South Wales and Western Australia extend to higher latitudes than those to which he alludes; and it is well known that the character of their wool is rising, and its quality improving.

Western Australia is removed by a long interval from the two colonies we have just described. Besides the advantages of position, the experience of twelve years, since the formation of the Swan River settlement, has shown Western Australia to be exempt from those periodical droughts which afflict the other colonies. An examination of the map of the colony, as far as the country has been explored, will explain the cause of this degree of fertilizing moisture. Mountain ranges, and alternations of hill and valley, will there be observed extending from north to south, to the eastward of the territory, and occasionally stretching across towards the sea-coast. Small but fertilizing streams—the sure consequences of mountainous variations of surface—are numerous throughout the whole extent of country which has been explored. The nature of the soil appears to vary little from that of the other known portions of Australia. A sandy belt is generally found to prevail near the coast. In traversing this arid strip of desert, the sufferings of the pioneers of civilization in Australia—those who are employed in the service of surveying the unknown portions of that vast continent—are generally dreadful. That such a beginning should have deterred many an adventurer from proceeding further is not wonderful; nor is it wonderful that the character of Australia in general has sometimes been stamped as most unpromising in consequence. As rivers in the old world flow towards the sea,

and do not stop half way, but flow on till they reach it, so it was naturally conjectured did rivers in this "last new" portion of the globe. But the case is widely different. With the sole exception of the Clarence river, no river yet known in Australia is not considerably larger towards its rise than towards the conclusion of its course; and the majority of the streams lose themselves in the sands before they approach the coast. In this manner the nature of the country bordering on the sea is no indication of that which may be found beyond. Captain Grey, in his travels in the north-west portion of Western Australia, has described, in his admirable and graphic manner, the miseries of the sandy and rocky territory; he has also given pictures of the fertile and promising portions which open the most important prospects for future colonization. In the following extract, which describes his feelings after he had passed through that burning ordeal of the coast, and had reached the fine country beyond, but was suffering from a severe wound received in an encounter with the natives, a train of thought is suggested which we hope will be echoed in the hearts of generations unborn:—

"The water of the stream revived me considerably. My wound, however, was very painful, and the interim between Corporal Coles leaving me and assistance arriving from the tent was spent in meditations, arising naturally from present circumstances. I sat upon the rocky edge of a cool clear brook, supported by a small tree. The sun shone out brightly, the dark forest was alive with birds and insects: on such scenery I had loved to meditate when a boy; but now how changed I was!—wounded, fatigued, and wandering in an unknown land. In momentary expectation of being attacked, my finger was on the trigger, my gun ready to be raised, my eyes and ears busily engaged in detecting the slightest sounds, that I might defend a life which I at that moment believed was ebbing with my blood away; the loveliness of nature was around me, the sun rejoicing in his cloudless career; the birds were filling the woods with their songs, and my friends far away and unapprehensive of my condition, whilst I felt that I was dying there. And in this way very many explorers yearly die. One poor youth, my own friend and companion, has thus fallen since the circumstances above described took place; others have, to my knowledge, lately perished in a similar way. A strange sun shines upon their lonely graves, the foot of the wild man yet roams over them; but let us hope—when civilization has spread so far that their graves will be sacred spots—that the future settlers will sometimes shed a tear over the remains of the first explorer, and tell their children how much they are indebted to the enthusiasm, perseverance, and courage of him who lies buried there."—*Journal of Captain Grey.*

Captain Grey examined the country between Cape Cuvier and Swan River; in the course of which survey he discovered ten rivers, two new mountain ranges, and three extensive districts of fine country. The country in the vicinity of the Swan River, and especially that to the south of it, abounds in fine soil, and has eminently the advantages of abundance of water. But the

natural advantages of Western Australia have been forgotten in the disasters of the Swan River settlement, which have, until lately, created a prejudice against that whole portion of the country. That settlement was founded on the erroneous principle of granting tracts of land to individuals without any payment, but simply on their promise to employ capital on them. One individual (Mr. Peel) received a grant of 500,000 acres; Sir James Stirling, the first governor, received 100,000. These great tracts could not be cultivated; "so that (as Mr. Wakefield forcibly described it in his evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons) the first operation in that colony was to create a great desert, to mark out a large tract of land, and to say, 'This is a desert—no man shall come here—no man shall cultivate this land.' " The consequences were, dispersion in the first place, then failure of the dispersed individuals, then second emigration to other colonies of the majority of the settlers, and finally, an unprogressive colony—for it has maintained its existence.

A new impulse has, however, been given to Western Australia, in the foundation of the new colony of Australind. The Western Australian Company, composed chiefly of large capitalists—Mr. William Hutt being their chairman, and Mr. John Chapman their deputy chairman—have purchased extensive blocks of land in the maritime county of Wellington, *on the pledge of Government* to employ the purchase-money in the conveyance of emigrants, of both sexes, and in equal numbers of the sexes, and have begun to send their colonists to this new field of enterprise. The principle they have adopted is, to employ fifty per cent. of the money they receive from purchasers of their land in the colony, in defraying the cost of emigration to the settlement. One of their ships sailed on the 17th of November last, carrying one hundred and sixty emigrants, exclusive of cabin and intermediate passengers. The site of their chief town, which is to be called Australind, is described as very beautiful. It is on the shores of the Leschenault inlet, an admirable roadstead for shipping, and in the midst of a tract of fertile country, consisting of one hundred thousand acres, belonging to the Company. Australind will be placed at the junction of two rivers, which, with two more, water the country which surrounds it. The prospects of the settlement are most encouraging, and we look forward to great results from the undertaking just begun.

The new settlement was noticed, and its expected founders were welcomed, in the following terms, by Governor Hutt, in his address to the colonists of Western Australia:—

"But the most striking event which has lately occurred in this colony

is, without doubt, the establishment of the new settlement at Australind, on the Leschenault estuary. It is calculated to be of lasting and important benefit to us, by the introduction of a fresh and large supply of capital, labour, and enterprize—by bringing Western Australia forward in an imposing and attractive light before the public, by making known its resources among influential parties in England.”—*From the New Zealand Journal*, Nov. 27, 1841.

We have not entered on any review of the two older colonies of Australia—New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land—because our purpose is exclusively with those which have been colonized on the new principle. Those older colonies were forced into prosperity by the command of convict labour, but they are now about to come under the same conditions with all the others, by ceasing to be penal settlements. Their grand desideratum, in common with all the others, is now a large and continued supply of labourers. This cannot be too often repeated to our own population.

Having arrived at a clear understanding of what colonization ought to be, it is only requisite to read the history of former colonies to discover the causes of their failures and disasters. In two lectures delivered by Mr. Woolcombe, at Plymouth, to the emigrants on the eve of departure for New Zealand, a rapid summary was given of these various failures, of which the following is an abstract. We cannot convey a better impression of the facts than by adopting his view of them. He enumerates the errors as follows:—

“1. As exhibited in the settlement of the first ‘New Plymouth,’ in America, and the kindred attempts of that age, wherein, from want of proper organization, and more especially of a right adaptation of labour and capital, the only evidences that a colony had been commenced were soon to be found only in the bones of the unfortunate pilgrims.

“2. Next, the system of extermination followed in the West Indies, with the remedy introduced by the benevolent but mistaken Las Cases, of compulsory immigration from Africa—the foundation of slavery and the slave trade.

“3. The white slavery of transportation colonies—the supplying capitalist adventurers with the labour of the refuse of English hulks and prisons.

“4. The Swan River folly, where to two or three individuals a grant of millions of acres was made by the Government of the day, the result of which was, that each became the centre of a tract of desert many miles square, while succeeding purchasers of land were, one after the other, removed beyond these barren properties, and all possibility of commercial intercourse and co-operation destroyed.

“5. The Cape of Good Hope colony, where circles of land were marked out to grantees, the interstices being left uncultivated and useless, and the other usual result here too exhibited, in a lamentable disproportion of labour and capital, wherever the circular sections were purchased by parties who wanted the means or inclination to supply the one or the other.”—*New Zealand Journal*, Oct. 30, 1841.

A mere reference to these respective errors and their consequences is sufficient. After the advance which has now been made in the theory and practice of colonization, we can scarcely apprehend the return to any such flagrant mistakes. But let us not imagine that perfection is gained. The true theory has undoubtedly been discovered, and, in the colonies which have been founded on that theory, the progress already made is, as we have shown, very great, and the prospects are highly encouraging. But there has not yet been a single instance of the full and fair application of the theory. In every case it has been applied in its most essential point—the price set on the land—*experimentally* : it has also had to contend with obstacles from the Colonial Office, or with difficulties from the local governments, or been begun at a disadvantage from slow surveys, &c. The journals and travels published by Bright, Leigh, and others, are full of complaints, which have their foundation in one or other of these causes ; and when the latter ends his work with advice to his countrymen “never to stir from their snug homes in search of ideal happiness in a wilderness”—an exhortation which would have more weight if his countrymen had all snug homes to leave—we understand why he received so disagreeable an impression during his “travels and adventures.” Such works as these are very useful and instructive ; they give practical illustrations of erroneous colonization. The account of New Zealand published by the Hon. H. W. Petre details a state of things in the rising colony of Port Nicholson which would be sufficient to ruin it, if its own strength and energy, and the grand advantages it enjoys from the nature of the country, were not sufficient to carry it on into vigorous maturity. This colony was founded by the New Zealand Company, not only without the slightest encouragement from the home Government, but actually whilst the Colonial Secretary repudiated it as no dependency of the British Crown. This private Company transferred thousands of persons, at its own risk, from England to this land in the antipodes, provided for their wants, set them in vigorous action, and maintained order and harmony, without the existence of any recognized laws. It was not till the Government tardily perceived the growing importance of the settlement, that New Zealand, to the great satisfaction of the colony and all concerned in it, was declared a dependency of the British Crown, and a charter of incorporation was granted to the Company. But here the vexations of the colonists did but commence : their provisional government, which had managed their affairs admirably well, terminated with the proclamation of the Queen’s authority. This proclamation was joyfully

received by them, but their joy was turned into disappointment when they found that no measures were taken to provide any competent authority in its place. The remoteness of the seat of government from the chief settlements has completed the vexations which the colonists have had to endure.

When so many disadvantages can be enumerated as having surrounded the last colony which has been founded, it is no wonder that we should find Mr. Wakefield complaining that the principle he enunciated has never had a fair trial. We have already mentioned the important article, on the Theory of Colonization, which he published in the *Colonial Gazette* of the 1st of December. To this article we must again refer.

“To a fair trial of the system (says he)—to such a trial, I mean, as would have exhibited its greatest power of emigration, without cost to the mother country—several conditions were indispensable.” “The first was (he continues), that the price required for the new land should be sufficient for the objects with which any price had been imposed.” Whether that *sufficient* price has yet been attained, remains to be seen. As the price is now rising, it would appear that it has hitherto been too low. That it must differ with the distance of the colony, and the consequent expense of conveying emigrants, is obvious.

“The second condition of a fair experiment (says Mr. Wakefield) was, that the whole, or at least some large, *fixed* proportion of the proceeds of sales should be devoted to immigration. This has been done nowhere. While it remains undone a principle element is wanting of any sound calculation as to what would be the proper price.” We must refer our readers to the regulations of the different colonial companies for the per centage on sales, which each is pledged to devote to immigration.

The third condition enumerated is, “that the *mode* of sale should be based on sound principles.” Mr. Wakefield argues against the plan of selling land by auction, and contends for the superior eligibility of a fixed uniform price.

The fourth condition was, that “the greatest liberty and facility of selection should be given to purchasers.” This would necessarily require the appointment of an ample and efficient surveying service; the history of South Australia, in especial, is a comment on its importance.

The fifth condition was, “whatever might be the price and mode of sale, both should be applied uniformly to all parts of a colony, and all of any group.” This is too obvious to require comment.

The sixth condition would require more space than our limits will afford to do it justice. It will probably startle some minds,

yet its soundness is indisputable, on mature consideration. It is that "sales to come should be anticipated by the raising of loans on the security of future sales, and the use of the proceeds of such loans to the purposes of emigration." We must refer our readers to the article itself for further consideration of this point, only reminding them, that the first settlers in a colony cannot, or will not, give that which is really a sufficient price, and that those who come afterwards can well afford to pay higher than those who stood the burden and heat of the day. It follows, therefore, that, in justice to those pioneers of civilization, as they may be called, the price given by their successors should be anticipated for their benefit. As to the objection to incurring debt, we may repeat, with Mr. Wakefield, "What then ! the borrowing of money, with a view to profit, is a legitimate proceeding, provided the borrowed money is laid out so as to ensure the means of its repayment, with profit besides.

We quote the seventh condition entire :—

"The seventh and last condition was, that the whole system should be *fixed*, or at least so far fixed, as not to be liable to change in any of its material parts without public discussion and ample notice. I cannot imagine how this should be done, except by Act of Parliament. At present everything is in a state of uncertainty, not to say of perpetual change. Nobody concerned in the matter seems to know what is his proper business, and still less what may happen in a month with respect to any part of the subject. At one time the Secretary of State determines, and the Governor finds some reason for declining to act on the instruction ; at another the Governor makes a plan of his own, which is upset by the Secretary of State. Sometimes Commissioners are to do everything, then the Colonial Office, next the local Governments ; and decisions of the utmost consequence are continually made as lightly, and with as little responsibility, as if nobody had an interest in them. In one settlement they sell by auction ; in another, close by, at the uniform price : in several places the auction obtains to-day, and the uniform price to-morrow. What portion of the proceeds of land-sales is devoted to immigration varies continually everywhere. As to many points, the language of regulations is so vague as to admit of different interpretations, and sometimes to be hard to comprehend. Distinctness, uniformity, order, and stability, are almost utterly wanting in almost every particular. Considering the unwillingness of most men to embark their fortunes in a career which hardly admits of calculation as to the future or the present, the wonder is, not that more has not been done with the new mode of colonization, but that so much has been accomplished."—*Colonial Gazette*, Dec. 1, 1841.

Here, then, if we add the want of a Church Establishment, we discover, in one luminous view, the causes of impediment to the highest successes of colonization, with the immediate remedy for all such causes of impediment. Not one of these impediments exist in the nature of the countries, nor in any contingent physical circumstances ; all their difficulties solely

originate in a deficiency of systematic arrangement and authority. Let the Government become the great mover and patron of colonization, and it will immediately receive the sympathy and approval of all who desire to ameliorate the condition of the distressed, by the most prompt and efficient means, and the support and co-operation of all who are anxious for the religious, moral, and commercial welfare and prosperity of their countrymen, at home and abroad.

We conclude with our fervent prayer, that England may yet be awakened to a sense of its great responsibility—its insular position—the amazing increase of its population—the restless energy of its inhabitants—its amazing wealth—its miraculous preservation from the actual miseries of war—the apostolicity of its Church—its countless charities—the solidity of its national character—its exemption from political revolutions: all these blessings have not been bestowed without corresponding duties and responsibilities. We read in the word of God, that “where much is given, much will be required;” and the time will come when, as a nation, we shall be called upon to give a strict account of the employment of our talents; let us, therefore, if we value these blessings, take heed that we deserve their continuance. It is not only a solemn, but a glorious mission that we are called upon to fulfil; and we trust that the time is at hand when England will not only be the greatest maritime and commercial, but also the first Christian power; and that her naval and military prowess may be instruments, in the hand of Divine Providence, of spreading the Gospel of Christ.

ART. IX.—*Party Politics and Political Prospects.* London: Painter. 1841.

2. *Ireland: her Church and her People.* By a TORY. London: Painter. 1841.

3. *The Journal of the Working Classes.* London: Painter. 1841.

THE principle on which the Whig-Radical Government of the last ten years was based—was that of SHUFFLING. Now we mean this in its fullest length and breadth, and in its every possible application. It was *shuffling* in its internal constitution, for the Government itself was always composed of discordant materials. It was *shuffling* in its alliances, for it sought, by various measures of concession, as well as by a multiplicity of cases of desertion of its own favourite measures, to propitiate the Conservative party in its favour; whilst, on the other hand, it held

out to the rampant O'CONNELL the hand of union and the olive branch of peace, which he, far greater than his masters, alternately accepted or repulsed, according as his popularity with his "*clique*" either required or refused. It was *shuffling* in its FOREIGN policy, whether we look to its measures as regarded Belgium, Poland, Spain, Portugal, France, Turkey, Egypt, Sicily, or the United States of America. There was not in all its conduct, with reference to the great questions at issue, any plain, obvious, straightforward line of manly, national, understandable, and straightforward British policy. It was *shuffling* in its HOME policy, whether we refer to its financial system, to its Post-office popular scheme of cheap postage and treasury deficiency, or to its affected reduction of taxation, though the revenue gradually diminished, and became inadequate to the national expenditure, leaving a deficit to be provided for by its Conservative successors. Nor, if we look at all the great *Home* questions which have occupied public attention during the last seven years, shall we find any other than a *shuffling* principle regulating the proceedings and acts of the late Government. It *shuffled* with all the *Irish* questions. It *shuffled* as to *Reform of Parliament*. It *shuffled* as to the question of *Church-rates*. It *shuffled* with the Dissenters, and their varied and futile claims for equality, if not for supremacy. It *shuffled* as to the *Ballot*. It *shuffled* as to the *Corn Laws*—one year declaring it would be madness to touch them, and the next urging their repeal as the *only* means of saving the country from ruin. It *shuffled* on all the great questions of taxation, and *blew hot, blew cold*, according to the degree of "*pressure from without*," and to its chances of being defeated on some favourite measure on the then next approaching parliamentary division. It *shuffled* with the Church of England, with her property, with her principles, and with her extension. It *shuffled* about literary property and literary men, and alternately encouraged and discouraged Mr. Serjeant TALFOURD. It *shuffled* in its COLONIAL policy; and its conduct on the great Canadian and Indian questions will be recorded in the page of impartial history as weak, vacillating, and disgraceful. There cannot be named one question of magnitude and importance on which it did not *shuffle* during the whole period of its continuance in office; and though last, not least, how did it not *shuffle* respecting its own retention of office! It resorted to every trick, made every description of combination, and set at defiance, year after year, the votes of Parliament, the defeats of its own measures, the oft-repeated expressions of public opinion, and even the disgust of its own reluctant supporters; crawling on in ignominy and disgrace, till

the country would bear it no longer, which, after having often scotched the snake, at length killed it outright. There is nothing strained, exaggerated, or over-coloured in this statement: it is plain, impartial history.

What were the inevitable consequences to the country of this sort of government during a period of several years? They may be summed up in a few words, but those few words must be severe and terrible. This *shuffling* Government left the treasury empty, and yet surrounded by importunate creditors: there were home creditors, foreign creditors, colonial creditors, public creditors, and Exchequer-bill frauds, to a fearful extent. This *shuffling* Government encouraged Chartism and Socialism, not by direct legislation in its favour, but by a sort of demi-protection afforded to its chiefs. It discouraged all the efforts of the Church to improve the condition of the people, by refusing to it all aid; whilst it encouraged Dissenters to pursue their system of aggression, promising them success "*in the long run!*" It deranged public opinion, and alarmed all the Conservative interests of the country, on the questions of corn, sugar, and timber; not that it was really convinced that any alterations were required in the import duties on those articles, but solely for the purpose of obtaining, by their agitation, a respite from that expulsion from office which it perceived must at last take place. It professed a horror for what the Chartists style "*class legislation;*" and yet its Poor Law is regarded by the Chartists themselves as "*far more objectionable than Sturges Bourne's Act!*" It professed the greatest possible anxiety for the intellectual and moral education of the people; and yet postponed, from year to year, any real national measure which should be acceptable to the virtue, talent, and religion of the country. Under its night-shade influence, sects and parties, of a political and religious character, sprung up of a most alarming and dangerous nature; and the literature of the country became impregnated with the licentiousness, vulgarity, indecency, and want of confidence and faith, of the French and what was once the German school. The migration at home, which it encouraged, led to the ruin of thousands who proceeded from the south to the north of England; and emigration from the British islands has been conducted so badly, that it will require all the prudence, foresight, and wisdom of a Conservative Government to render emigration generally popular or practicable. It left the Poor Laws an open question; the Corn Laws an open question; the Church-rates an open question; Church Extension an open question; the Scotch Intrusion subject an open question; the Irish Vagrant Act an open question; the laws relative to literary property an

open question; the whole of the matter of Scotch Poor Laws an open question; and did not dare to close one of these by any bold and honest proposition fairly and manfully submitted to parliamentary discussion and decision.

It has left a Chinese war as a glorious inheritance to its successors; and has claimed the merit of having "*settled*" the affairs of the East, even though each Syrian dispatch brings us the record of some new disaster. It has felicitated itself on the "*termination*" of the Spanish war of succession, whilst LOUIS PHILIPPE is intriguing for the throne of Spain for his son, and the Queen Mother is aiding him in his *family* policy. It has boasted of its *quadruple alliance*, and yet the republican flag is unfurled, and the Basque provinces are again threatened with a seven years' war. It has proclaimed in Parliament, and in its journals, the principle of commercial reciprocity, and yet it has been unable to bring to any conclusion its seven years' pending negotiations with France. It has heaped favour upon favour on the French Customs, but has obtained no concession in return. It has ruined our trade with Turkey; disturbed our friendship with Sicily; failed in its negotiations with the German Customs Confederation; compelled Holland to rely on her own resources and to decrease her trade with England; stood still and looked on whilst France and the United States of America have placed their trade with Portugal on a footing of equality with our own; and, by its policy in the East, neither raised the Syrians, benefitted the Turks, nor propitiated the Egyptian viceroy in our favour.

At HOME it has brought about a commercial crisis of a gloomy and threatening character, by encouraging over-trading—by jeopardizing the condition of the large landowners and farmers—by disturbing public credit and confidence—by neglecting measures of precaution—by bringing about a general impression that vast sweeping changes were to take place in some of the most permanent interests of the country—and by thus presenting us to foreign powers in the attitude of a divided and distracted, instead of an united and energetic, people.

Who, then, can wonder that meetings are convened to take into consideration the condition of the working classes—to examine into the causes of the distress of the manufacturing districts—to provide remedies for want of labour, uncertain trade, and depreciated commerce—to address the QUEEN—to petition Parliament—and to devise means for relieving present want, and providing against future and increased misery? For ourselves, we confess that such assemblies by no means surprise us. The evils which we deplore, and the sufferings we compassionate,

and which are principally, though not wholly, the results of many years of bad government, and of a total want of prudence and foresight, are of a fearful character ; and were not such men as WELLINGTON, PEEL, STANLEY, GRAHAM, ABERDEEN, and GOULBURN at the helm of our public affairs, backed by a Christian and Conservative majority in both Houses of Parliament, we confess we should be inclined to despond, if not to despair.

In looking, then, fully in the face "THE STATE OF THE NATION," which we propose doing in this article, we have thought it right to review, in the first place, not only the policy, but the results of the policy of the late Whig-Radical Government ; and most unhesitatingly we proclaim our deliberate conviction, that a vast majority of the evils which now bear upon our manufacturing and commercial classes must and ought to be ascribed to the SHUFFLING policy of the MELBOURNE Administration.

The moral, political, financial, and commercial policy of a country cannot be *utterly wrong*, during a period of seven years, without affecting sensibly, and to a great extent, all the vast and staple interests of the people.

We are anxious, however, to guard against a popular error which always finds currency even in good times, but which is yet more popular, and still more frequently resorted to, in bad times. We allude to the popular error which ascribes, in difficult times, every existing evil *to the Government ! !* Now, even in absolute governments, where the will of the monarch is supreme, and where taxes are levied, lands disposed of, and wars made, without the control of any intervening power between the government and the people, this habit of ascribing all evils *to the government* is still indefensible ; for it will be easy to show, in a few sentences, that there are very many causes of evil over which *no human government*, however perfect, can have an *absolute* control.

There is, for instance, the case of a country, whose inhabitants are eminently agricultural, being afflicted with hail-storms, with a succession of bad weather, with blight, and, in one word, with a total failure of crops ! Although there may be national granaries, and a large supply of corn provided against scarcity, yet a *general failure of crops* will lead to an immense advance in the price of bread, and consequently to misery, if not to starvation and death ! Then, as another instance, there is the case of a country whose inhabitants are eminently commercial ; they enjoy the liberty of commerce ; they carry on trade with a large and powerful ally to a very great amount ; but of a sudden that ally (as was recently the case with the United States of Ame-

rica) becomes embarrassed to an unparalleled extent—its paper currency becomes valueless—its credit is shaken to the base—the houses which dealt with its merchants have all their commercial bills returned; and, as was the case with *Lyons*, especially during the last commercial crisis in the United States, the towns and cities carrying on the largest amount of commercial transactions with that power become embarrassed and paralyzed. Who could honestly and truly blame the government of France, during that commercial panic in North America, for the distresses occasioned to Lyons by American failures? And yet the opposition, and, above all, the French Republican press, did not hesitate so to do during the whole duration of the evil.

And, as a third instance, we might give the case of the manufacturing interests of a third power suffering from a war between two rival powers. A war between France and the United States, or between France and Russia, would lead to incalculable manufacturing disasters to England; and yet who could justly blame the *English Government* for such wars and such results?

And if we look at the cases of governments which are *not* of an absolute character, but which are, like those of England, of a mixed or constitutional nature, shall we not discover additional and yet more powerful objections to that popular error which ascribes all evils which exist in a nation *to the government of that nation*? A constitutional government has sometimes measures imposed upon it in the form of acts and results, measures and acts of the government which preceded it, and yet which it cannot repeal. The great deficiency in the revenue occasioned by the very sudden total change in the postage of letters is an example of what we here mean to indicate; and yet no government, desiring to stand well with the masses, as a powerful means of carrying out wise plans of prudent and called-for amendment, would begin its career by now raising the tax upon letters. The late Government and the late Parliament have in this matter imposed an annual deficiency of a very considerable amount on ~~the~~ present Government, in the Post-office department; and yet, if new taxes be necessary to make up that deficiency, there are multitudes who would exclaim, “the *Government* is to be blamed for this.” But *what Government*?

Then a constitutional Government has sometimes measures imposed upon it as the result of the mistakes or bad conduct and policy of its predecessors. For instance, Sir ROBERT PEEL has accepted office with an *empty treasury*, and yet with a cry of “*Repeal the Corn Laws!*” got up by the late Administration to perpetuate its continuance in office, and still fostered and encouraged by the letters of Lord JOHN RUSSELL and of Lord

PALMERSTON. On the one hand, the deficiency in the revenue *must be met* ; on the other hand, the cry for the repeal of the Corn Laws, or for the alteration of the duties, or for the improvement of the sliding scale, must be taken into consideration. A Conservative Government looks such questions fully in the face, and, as far as possible, does right by them—indifferent to the passions and prejudices of those who still dare to cry, though they themselves are the causes of a great portion of the embarrassment, “ *it is the fault of the Tory Government.*”

And, finally, a constitutional Government must submit to the decisions of Parliament ! Sometimes a majority may be deluded, or gained over, or intimidated by popular clamour, and may throw out or pass measures, in both cases, against the wishes and the convictions of the Administration then in office. The measures so passed may lead to vast evils ; and yet there are millions of ignorant or of passionate people who will still insist that “ *it is the fault of the Government.*”

But, besides these cases, where the cry of “ *the Government is to be blamed*” is raised by the ignorant or the wicked, there are multitudes of others where evils of a transient or even of a permanent character occur to a community, for which it would seem evident that none but fools or madmen would blame the Government ; and yet, without being positively either, they *do* blame the Government. We will specify a *few* of these, as they bear distinctly on “ *the State of the Nation.*”

We have a largely increasing population. Every year the land, or trade, or commerce, or manufactures, or the professions, the arts and the sciences, have to provide, in Great Britain alone, for *three hundred and sixty-five thousand additional souls*. We were much pleased by the plain and yet philosophical manner in which this question of increased population, and its bearing on national resources, was put in the fifth number of *The Journal of the Working Classes*. Men blame the landowners, the farmers, the millers, the merchants, the peasants, all in their turn, because bread is dear, wages are low, and trade is bad ; but they never think of asking themselves the plain and obvious question, of how a loaf of bread can satisfy the appetites of *eight* persons as well as it used to do those of *four* ? Or how a country, with nearly 27,000,000 of souls, in 1841, should be able to avoid occasional embarrassments, when, in 1821, only twenty years previously (and during which time there has been no war), that same country had a population of 5,750,000 less ? This vast increase of population had not been met by any national measure of colonization, nor indeed by any other great plan, except the construction of railways ; but has not the

additional labour there required been more than met by the deterioration in the value and amount of labour required in the towns and villages on the old turnpike roads throughout the country, and which have been comparatively ruined by the new system? The increase of population in the British isles is a question which *must be met*. The morals and the religion of the country have repudiated *Socialism*, and all other checks on population, except such checks as prudence would suggest, viz., that men and women should feel it their *duty* to abstain from marriage, unless reasonably assured of the means, by adequate labour and wages, of supporting independently their offspring during at least the first ten years of their childhood. It is absurd and pedantic to search for secondary causes for existing evils, when some of a primary nature are self-evident. The land, the trade, the commerce, the manufactures, the professions, and the arts and sciences of this country, do not supply, with sufficient rapidity, the means of comfortable existence to the one thousand extra souls and bodies which are *daily* added to the population of these realms ! This question of population has been kept out of sight by the free trade anarchists and demagogues ; but it must be looked to and met. It is *not* the fault of the Government that the population increases at so astounding a rate ; nor is it the fault of the Government that the present resources of the country are *not* adequate to the demands made upon them : but it would be *greatly* the fault of the Government if it did *not* indicate to this rapidly increasing population, that there are colonies belonging to Great Britain which are as yet unpopulated, uncultivated, and comparatively unknown, to which the agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing population *may* repair, with the *certainty* of thereby ameliorating their physical condition.

The creation of a circulating medium, unrepresented by anything like a corresponding amount in the precious metals, is *another* capital point over which the British Government *alone* cannot exercise that influence which should render it responsible. There is not less than 35,000,000 of paper money in circulation, issued in the United Kingdom by the banks of England and Ireland, and by private and joint stock banks. How far this amount of paper money circulation may exercise a beneficial or an injurious operation on the *permanent* commercial interests of the country, is a question which the Government alone is not left to decide. Parliament has come to *its* decisions, and the Government cannot be responsible for the results of measures which it did not counsel or propose. Yet whenever the issues of these private and joint stock banks are too great, and a false

system of credit and speculation is excited, immediately the cry is heard, "*It is the fault of the Government!!*"

Another real or supposed source of diminution in the demand for manual labour, as well as in the value of wages, is the *multiplication of machinery!* Yet what would be thought in this country of a government proposing restrictions on the application of science to improvements in machinery? And what would be the fate of a bill, if proposed to either House of Parliament, for effecting such an object? It is unnecessary to say that such a bill would not even obtain the honour of a first reading. And yet what say the most clamorous of the agitators among the working classes in the manufacturing districts? Do they not daily declare that machinery has "ruined the country, and that the *Government* is to blame for permitting machinery?"

"But it is the fault of the Government (exclaims the angry *Chronicle* or the petulant *Globe*) "*that the Corn Laws are not repealed,*" and "that the manufacturers are unable to dispose of their manufactured goods in immense quantities all over Europe, and thus secure employment to the working classes, as well as cheap bread and flour." Undoubtedly, if the MELBOURNE Cabinet had been *really* convinced of the necessity for this measure and of its infallible success, and yet had not, till the last moment, and as the *dernier ressort* to enable it to retain office a few months longer, proposed its adoption, it would have merited the blame of every man in the community. But it had no such conviction; and the juggle during the last few months of the existence of that Administration has been too frequently exposed to require a further denunciation. The MELBOURNE Cabinet knew quite well, that Great Britain could never consent to place the supply of her immense population with food at the mercy of foreign markets, or at the risk of foreign wars. It knew quite well, that in the *repeal* of the Corn Laws was involved a whole revolution—and a revolution not simply of a political or of a party, but of a social, character. It knew, as well as Sir ROBERT PEEL does, that the very smallest portion of the Corn Law question is its *fiscal* influence or operation, and that the landowners of this country are at all times prepared to make such sacrifices of their own personal interests as may be *really* necessary for the *general weal*.

If the Corn Laws were so objectionable, and if their influence was so pernicious, why was not their repeal proposed during the tremendous crisis of 1836-7? The influenza was raging, the winter was unusually severe, the manufacturing districts were suffering most awfully, and even the Poor Law Commissioners avowed that they were staggered in the application of their pro-

hibitive order, to afford none but *workhouse relief* to the miserable and destitute. The crisis, at the present moment, sad as it is, is by no means equal in severity to that under which the labouring classes then suffered. Yet we did not hear of the repeal of the Corn Laws *then*! And why? Lord MELBOURNE's Cabinet had still a majority *in the House of Commons sufficient to enable it to retain office*, without seeking to agitate to the centre the whole kingdom. The Government of Lord MELBOURNE was not *then* deserving of blame, for not proposing, when it had a majority in the House of Commons, an alteration in the Corn Laws, because it did not believe such a measure to be necessary; but it has since stamped itself with disgrace and shame, for having brought forward that alteration at a period when it no longer possessed the confidence of the House or the country, and for pressing it on now for the purposes of agitation. With respect to the Government of Sir ROBERT PEEL, it has not yet met, since its examination of the whole question of the Corn Laws, the Houses of Parliament. If it shall be found that the present system is defective, alterations will undoubtedly be proposed: the sliding scale may be amended, and the averages may be taken more correctly; but never will a Conservative Government forget, that the question, of whether England shall cease to be an agricultural country, can never, by it, be resolved in the affirmative; nor will it cease to remember, that such a question is one bound up with the Constitution, the State, and the integrity of the empire. It is not a party question, but a State measure.

When, therefore, the *Chronicle* and the *Globe*, Lord JOHN RUSSELL and Lord PALMERSTON, assert that the Government of Sir ROBERT PEEL is to be blamed because bread is dear, and flour is higher priced in London than at Paris, they purposely keep back this fact, that during some years after their accession to office they had a decided majority for their measures in the House of Commons, and yet that the repeal of the Corn Laws, and a free trade in corn, were then no projects of either the then Premier or his coadjutors.

Again we ask, why? And again we reply, because *they* knew, as well as the Conservatives do, that the Corn Law question is one in which is involved even more than the question of food; since the destruction of the agricultural interests, the subversion of the aristocracy, and the triumph of the Democratic over the Conservative and hereditary institutions of the country, are *all involved* in its consequences and results.

We have dwelt at considerable length on the popular error of ascribing to the Government *all the evils which visit a great*

country, because the evils arising from that error are almost overwhelming.

“We shall see what the Tories will do!” cries one. “What are the plans of Sir ROBERT for restoring prosperity to the country?” asks a second. “The Tories will do no more than the Whigs!” growls a Chartist; and then he adds, “*Class legislation is our ruin. We must have a Government which will put an end to this. All our miseries are to be ascribed to our governors.*”

Now this is all sheer nonsense! We cannot call it by any other name; for truth itself stamps this stigma upon it. The fact is, that the Government of a country is far less powerful to good, than it is to evil. The advantages attendant on a Conservative Government are more of a negative than of a positive character. A Conservative Government prevents mischief, foresees evil, and provides, as far as it can do, a remedy. But, after all, so much depends on public opinion, in constitutional states, that, with a House of Commons composed of six hundred and fifty-eight members, a Government must not be expected to work miracles! It can execute vigorously and constantly the laws; it can oppose invasions on the rights of the Crown, on the privileges of the aristocracy, and on the liberties of the people. It can keep parties and factions in their places; and, when they transgress the laws, it can punish all infractions! It can encourage moral and religious influences, and visit with just vengeance all infractions on public morals and religion. It can set a good example, as a Government, and also as individual members of the great community. It can submit wise and prudent measures to the *Parliament*, and urge their adoption. But it can do nothing beyond this! After all, the Parliament is omnipotent, and the Government is bound to obey. Indeed, the position of a Conservative Government must always be a painful rather than an agreeable one, except that men of vast talents and mighty minds love good, and the practice of good, for the sake of the good itself, since what can be less *popular*, in the common acceptation of that term, than a Conservative Cabinet? We know that such a Cabinet appeals from the ignorance, folly, vanity, and passion of party, to the sense, wisdom, and moderation of wise and good men; but then how much more noisy, clamorous, and even powerful with the mass, are the former than the latter!

Notwithstanding all these, and a multiplicity of other sources of anxiety and opposition, Sir ROBERT PEEL has accepted office; and the course he has hitherto adopted has been such as to entitle him to the love and gratitude, respect and homage, of

all who prefer truth to falsehood, and honest government to dishonest *shuffling*. That course has been the following: he has refused to adopt the plans, measures, schemes, representations, or statistics of those who carried on the Government of the country by *shuffling*. He has asked himself this question, "*What is the real State of the Nation?*" and he has spared no trouble, no reasonable expense, and no details of enquiry, to enable him to arrive at full, honest, and just conclusions.

And now let us look at what must have been the results to his own mind, as well as to the minds of his coadjutors, of the examinations he has conducted:—

He has found that owing to the encouragement given by the Poor Law Commissioners to the agricultural poor to migrate from the southern to the northern counties of England, that the population of the labouring classes has been greatly displaced. This displacement has been exceedingly injurious to multitudes of individuals, who were induced to believe that there was *really* a vast amount of labour required in the north, and which could not be adequately supplied by Irish immigration. He must have discovered that a very great number of southern poor are therefore now out of employment in the north; and that when these southern poor, who went to the north fully expecting to obtain permanent employment at the manufactories, but who were disappointed, are added to the unemployed northern or habitual workmen, there can be no surprise that so many are without the means of independent existence: they are living on charity, or on the parish.

If in 1836 and 1837, instead of encouraging migration from the distressed agricultural counties in the south to the manufacturing counties in the north, the then Government had aided, on a large and national scale, the population which thus migrated to have emigrated to our North American colonies, we should have had, by this time, corn from our own colonies, and a population requiring large supplies from our own home manufactories.

He must have found that the crisis in the United States of America, which is not yet over, has been greatly injurious to our manufacturing interests; and that American capital has not yet acquired confidence, but is looking, as is all Europe, to see what England will do, whilst English manufacturers are waiting for foreign demands for English manufactured goods.

He must have found that many countries are at this moment afflicted with evils similar to those which weigh us down, and that the financial crises of other powers naturally operate upon our own.

He must have found that whilst it is a difficult matter to de-

cide up to what precise point a paper currency, nominally convertible into the precious metals, ought to be encouraged or permitted, since in nine cases out of ten the conversion by private banks is a *mere delusion*; yet that it is a fact, that the encouragement given by the joint stock and other banks to the mania of 1835 and 1836, for erecting new cotton mills and factories in the north, has turned out to have been extremely prejudicial.

He must have found that the rumours of war between France and Great Britain, which existed for more than twelve months, and which ought never to have lasted one week, if the then British Government had acted with promptitude and energy, greatly paralyzed all our staple interests, and materially added to those evils which previously existed.

He must have found that the unsettled state of Spain—that the financial and commercial crisis in Belgium—that the commercial arrangements of Germany, and the diminution in the demand by Holland for British manufactures, have tended materially to increase prior uncertainty and suffering in our manufacturing districts.

Above all, he must have found that the great increase in the population of the manufacturing districts, during the last ten years, is *alone* sufficient to account for a vast deal of the misery and destitution which now exist.

In *Lancashire* alone the population has increased, in ten years, no less than 330,210 persons: being in 1831, 1,336,854 souls, and in 1841, 1,667,064 souls.

He has found in this county of Lancashire that there are no less than 23,604 uninhabited houses, most of which were madly erected on the sad assumption that a vast quantity of labour, not indigenous, would be required in the north; whereas the crisis in America, and the state of Europe, with the financial crises in France and Belgium, rendered the demand for British manufactures much less, and produced therefore a falling off in the demand for additional labour.

In *Warwickshire* the population has increased, in ten years, from 336,610 to 402,121; and in that county there is also a very considerable number of uninhabited houses.

In the *West Riding of Yorkshire* the population in 1831 was 976,350; whilst in 1841 it is 1,154,924.

In *Staffordshire* the population in 1841 is 510,206; whilst in 1831 it was 410,512—no less than 100,000 increase in ten years.

In *Durham* the population in 1831 was 253,910; but in 1841 it is 324,277. This increase of 70,000 in the county of Durham is a fact of a most striking character.

In *Derbyshire* the population has increased 35,000; in *North-umberland*, 28,000; in *Nottinghamshire*, 24,000; and, in one word, in all the counties where manufactures are wholly or greatly the staple employment of the working classes, the population has increased in a fearful ratio.

He must have found, therefore, that as this increase is still augmenting, whilst the demand for British manufactures does not keep pace with this increase of population, that some remedy must be provided, and that such a remedy is undoubtedly to be found in not mere emigration but colonization.

The *Quarterly Review* has said:—

“Before emigration is tried let us endeavour to occupy our waste lands. Millions of acres are still unreclaimed, both in Great Britain and Ireland. Stop the gambling speculations of the manufacturers, and drain off the surplus population from towns into the country. Let landlords plant colonies on their commons, and bogs, and mountains—plant them under their own eye, upon right principles of colonization, in organic bodies, with powers of self-government, with social privileges, with the germs of village institutions; especially with that first principle of life and organization, an efficient ecclesiastical establishment in the centre. Restore something of the feudal spirit into our tenure of land. Raze, if you like, to the ground half our over grown metropolis.”

The difference between our views and those of the *Quarterly* consists in this—that whereas the *Quarterly* would defer emigration until home colonization were carried out—we would, on the contrary, put both engines to work at the same time. There are one thousand more beings to be provided for to-day than there were when yesterday we commenced these observations, and by the day they will appear before the public there will be fifteen thousand more. Nor must we forget, that by the very simplest process of calculation, as we have been increasing one thousand per diem with a smaller population than at present, we shall of course increase more than one thousand per diem with an increased population to increase upon.

The *Globe* is alarmed at the proposal of the *Quarterly*. It exclaims, “We are threatened with an agrarian barbarism, as the result of a landed monopoly.” And again, “We are to have home colonization on the principles of patriarchal or feudal protection.” But the *Globe* has no other remedies than these to propose, and it knows that if such remedies be well, continuously, and vigorously applied, its *illustrious* correspondents will in vain seek to agitate the country by pleading for the overthrow of the landed interests.

Sir ROBERT PEEL must have found, that the greatest evil with which this country is threatened is a redundant population; and he must feel that it is his duty to provide a remedy.

He must have found, that such a remedy is not to be sup-

plied by the pretended unlimited demand for British manufactures. He must *know* how other nations are seeking, not only to rival, but even to eclipse us, in their manufactories; and that there was never a greater intentional delusion than the one attempted to be practised upon the people of this country, which was palmed off in the cry of "*Repeal the Corn Laws!*" Which are the countries requiring immense quantities of our goods, and willing to exchange them for cheap corn? It is worse than useless—it is ridiculous, on the part of the *Morning Chronicle*, daily to be making quotations of prices at Hamburgh of bread and meat, and of the demands for British goods in Poland! These are calculations for schoolboys, and financial and commercial speculations for children. They may amuse, but cannot deceive. If manufactures are to supply the present unemployed and employed workmen of this country with full occupation and adequate wages, as well as to supply the one thousand extra souls and bodies born each day, and that not for one, or two, or five, or seven years, till another crisis shall arrive, but permanently and efficiently, let us be apprized officially and surely of such permanent arrangements with France, Spain, Germany, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Portugal, Austria, Italy, Turkey, Egypt, Russia, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and the Hanse Towns, as can leave no doubt respecting the large, long continued, and constant demand for such manufactures. But who does not know that such arrangements are impossible? Who does not know that, in every part of Europe and of America, attempts are making to establish manufactures similar to those of which we enjoyed a long monopoly, but shall enjoy no more? It is worse than childish—it is wicked and ruinous, to shut our eyes to such truths as these. Our ambassadors, our consuls, and our vice-consuls have been consulted; and what have been their replies? They could have been none other than these:—

1. That most of the European and American powers are seeking to manufacture.

2. That many have made great progress, and attained great perfection. And

3. That whatever they can manufacture at home for their own consumption, which will be purchased instead of our manufactures, they will encourage and protect.

“But (say the advocates of free trade) we take cotton from the United States, wool from Germany, silk from Italy, and flax from Russia; and if the reciprocity principle be well understood and enforced, the cotton, the wool, the silk, and the flax should be paid for by our manufactures.”

Agreed to. But why, during *ten* years of *shuffling* government have *you* not been able to bring about this sort of reciprocity? For this obvious reason, that it is not Governments that sell, or Governments that manufacture, but private individuals; and private individuals will carry their raw produce to where they get paid for it in that which is most desirable for them, and on which they can make the greatest profit. And why do the precious metals leave this country for Europe in such large quantities? Because our manufactures are not so valuable as gold and silver. In one word, it is a farce to affect to believe, that, with our increased and yet more increasing population, we can keep up such a supply, and maintain such a commerce of manufactured goods with foreign nations, as to supply that population, not only as it exists to-day, but as it will be, increased nearly 400,000 more, before the end of the year on which we are now entering.

Sir ROBERT PEELE must have found, however, that the Corn Law repeal agitation is rather subsiding than increasing, and that the working classes are themselves beginning to understand the delusion which has been practised upon them.

He must have found the administration of the *Poor Laws* to be most unpopular, and that it will become essential to remove the jurisdiction from Somerset House to the Home Office. He must have found that the system at present pursued has led—

1. To a fearful increase of mendicity, arising from the determination of the pauperized labourers not to exist in the Unions.

2. To an enormous augmentation of sheep-stealing.

3. To a vast addition to the number of vagrants.

4. To an increase in infanticide.

5. To a great increase in prostitution and concubinage. It is true that legalized bastardy is less; but the bastardy which is not declared, and which leads to the man and woman cohabiting without marriage, has increased to a most fearful extent.

6. To an augmentation in the crimes of petty theft, and smaller, though deplorable, offences.

He must have found, that the plan adopted by the Poor Law Commissioners, of laying down a general rule of relief never to be departed from, is impossible; and that the knowledge of those who, on the spot, administer relief, must of necessity be more valuable and correct than any which may be possessed by a Central Board in London. Nor can he have failed to observe, that in proportion as things right themselves, and the population of the country settles down into its natural state, that the first apparent great difference between the amount of the poor's-rates, in some districts, before the Poor Act passed, and the next year or two after its passing, becomes less striking;

and that much more good has been stated to have resulted from the measure than has really taken place.

He must have found, that the distress existing in the manufacturing districts of the country is most deplorable; but that those who are in *real* distress are willing to emigrate, to colonize, to do anything which may appear wise and prudent, to improve their condition. The labourers, mechanics, and artisans of this country, in their social character, are essentially Conservative. We state this broadly and plainly. We do not say that, *politically*, they are either Whig or Tory. They are not so; but, *socially*, they are Conservative: they respect their employers; they love the Church; they desire the religious education of their children; they are no levellers in their notions of property; and are rarely deceived by the representations made to them of the advantages which would result from their becoming the masters, and their masters becoming their labourers. The mere possession of land, without capital to work it, is no utopia of theirs. They prefer the marriage state, and family life; have a great love for their offspring; a great attachment to their localities and local authorities; and, on the whole, a feeling of respect and quiet submission for those whom God, in his providence, has placed in this world above them.

We are well aware that the Chartists and the Socialists cannot be included in this number, especially the latter; and we are likewise aware that many thousands of members of trades' unions profess subversive doctrines: but they are doctrines they would not fight for; they would fight for their hearths and their homes, poor though they be, but very few indeed would fight for the Charter; and even all these Socialists, and Chartists, and ultra-Radicals combined, what are they in number when compared with the inert, though not less sincere, mass of the right-thinking poor?

And it is just because there is this Conservative social feeling amongst the working classes that we feel so strong an interest in their welfare. How different are their hearts to those of the French labouring people! or to the Belgian labourers! or to the Spanish, or Portuguese, or Italian poor! The English cottager, and even the mechanic, with all his desultory notions on some subjects, is staid and steady in his home-and-hearth Conservatism; whereas in the countries to which we have alluded, their social state is even more in jeopardy than their political government.

Sir ROBERT PEEL must have found, that neither the increase of our manufactories, the repeal of our Corn Laws, nor the operation of our Poor Law system, will provide bread for such num-

bers of our present destitute poor as now require immediate and continuous aid. And, at the same time, he must have found, that this condition may be *wholly* changed and converted into one of comparative ease and happiness by a large national system of emigration.

But he must also have found, that to emigration on a large scale there are many popular objections; and these are urged with vehemence on the working classes. It is said—

1. Emigration has failed.
2. Emigration has been badly conducted.
3. Emigration, as encouraged or enforced by the Poor Law Commissioners, has rendered that system wholly unpopular.
4. Emigration, to be of any use, must be conducted on a very large scale; and that would require very large funds.
5. Where are the funds to come from? Not from the poor emigrants!—they have none. Not from the parishes in which they are at present residing—for the parishes where the greatest number of destitute and unemployed labourers, mechanics, and artisans now reside are so poor, as to be unable to make any such contribution. Not from the Government—for how can the country pay new taxes, when it can scarcely pay those at present in force? And the notion of making a *loan*, the capital of which should be secured by the unreclaimed millions of acres in our colonies, and the interest of which would be the annual rents payable by the colonists to the Government for the lands, has been attacked as impracticable and ruinous.
6. It has been said, “Of what use is it to take out to the Canadas, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, half famished and diseased artisans? They will be swept away by cold, fever, and ague.”
7. Then it has been observed, that the only persons who can go out with probable advantage to themselves must be able-bodied and healthy agricultural labourers; and that these prefer, in spite of all their difficulties, remaining at home.
8. It is asked, what is to become of these unemployed thousands and tens of thousands, before a large national system of emigration can be organized?
9. What is to be done with them, on landing in North America, until they can not only earn their own livings, but convert the produce of their labour into money?
10. Where and how are the food, houses, and clothing to be provided for them against they arrive there?
11. Then the climate, the character of the soil, and the unprepared state of things there, both physically and morally, are urged with great zeal and envy. And

12. The over-cautious exclaim, "Take care! You know how you were served by the United States! You will raise important colonies at immense expense, and then, in the course of a few years, they will shake off their allegiance to the mother country.

And yet, notwithstanding these varied objections, Sir ROBERT PEEL must have found, that public opinion is strongly in favour of emigration and colonization, and that the objections we have referred to can all be removed.

He must have found, that in spite of the distress which exists in our manufacturing districts, and of the long continued bad weather, which has inundated some agricultural counties and brought great sorrow and anxiety into all, still there is a vast amount of capital always ready to be applied even to plausible undertakings, and an amazing quantity of energy and confidence amongst all classes. He must have found, that *railway traffic* is being carried on at the rate of upwards of *three millions of pounds sterling per annum*, and carrying fifteen millions of passengers; nearly all of which is expended on British iron, British coals, British buildings, British land, and British labour. He must have found, that the receipts on thirty-three railways, during only *one week*, lately, was—

For passengers	£47,799	13	10
For goods	17,045	7	9
	<hr/>		
	£64,845	1	7;

or at the rate of 52*l.* per mile per week.

He must have found, that the number of bankruptcies in 1841 in England and Wales, during the first nine months, and therefore to the 1st October last, was less than in 1840, though more than in 1839; the numbers being—

In 1841	967
In 1840	1,067
In 1839	728

He must have found a very obvious difference in 1841 as to the *nature* of the bankruptcies, there being fifteen fewer bankruptcies in every branch of trade and manufacture than in last year, and in agricultural pursuits twenty-three less. In Lancashire, during the first nine months of last year, there were six bankruptcies, and this year only three more; whilst in Yorkshire there were forty-four, and this year only twenty.

He must have found a great improvement in our trade with France. The goods imported from England into France have doubled in six years, and in 1840 amounted to 100,000,000 of francs, or 4,000,000*l.* sterling. Thread and coal are the prin-

cial articles which have caused the increase. Of these there were only 13,000 quintals of English thread imported into France in 1830 ; whilst there were 61,500 in 1840. The importation of British coal into France, which amounted to 71,000 tons in 1835, attained 325,000 tons in 1840.

Whilst the distress at Paisley, Leeds, Manchester, and Spitalfields, as well as at other places, must naturally have wounded his heart, he has not forgotten that Spitalfields has long been the source of anxiety and sorrow to all who take a deep interest in our *silk* manufacture. The years 1836-37 were most lamentable for the population of Bethnal-green, Spitalfields, and the surrounding parishes. These crises are painful, difficult, and dangerous ; but this is not the only country that is subject to them. The history of the sorrows and suffering of the silk weavers in Lyons, during the last seven years, would be one yet more painful to write and to read than that of our own Spitalfields weavers. A suggestion has been made to us by a benevolent individual, which we think as practicable as it is praiseworthy, and therefore we here introduce it. Let every female in England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, who can afford it, whether in the middling or upper classes, order, at this season of family mirth and festivity, *a new silk dress of Spitalfields manufacture*. Those who are in middling circumstances would order, of course, a less expensive one than those in the upper circles ; and, indeed, the latter, in very many cases, might order two, or even three. The effect which such a general measure would produce would be prodigious. If only one million of females adopted this suggestion, at least from twelve to fifteen millions of yards of Spitalfields silk would at once be required. Right joyous shall we be if this suggestion shall be supported by the press of this country, and if the public shall press forward to carry its execution into effect. We are well aware that such efforts can only be occasional, but the good resulting from such an effort as this would be prodigious. Is it impossible ? We really think not.

We are fully aware that, in making this very suggestion, we lay ourselves open to the objection, that such a measure would only afford temporary relief. This we admit. But the temporary relief it would afford would be one hundred times greater than that which can be supplied by subscriptions, soup, coals, or clothing. Nor would the advantage be confined to Spitalfields alone : the ribband weavers would be benefitted : the button makers, the silk cord makers, the makers of hooks and eyes, and the retail as well as wholesale dealers in all these articles would be encouraged, consoled, and assisted. There is

no wholesale method with which we are acquainted of getting rid of misery; but it must be met by various expedients—some temporary, and others permanent.

Sir ROBERT PEEL must have found, that public works, on a large scale, may be attempted and set on foot. There are waste lands to enclose, bogs to drain and cultivate, churches to erect, chapels of ease to construct, public schools to build, public walks and parks to form, and, we may add, public baths for the poorer classes, both hot and cold, in our large towns, to which they might be admitted at very small prices, would greatly tend to the health and comfort of the people. Thus, although colonization and emigration we commend and desire, there is much, very much, also, to be effected at home.

If from these subjects of a physical character we turn to the *Moral and Religious State of the Nation*, Sir ROBERT PEEL must have found much to encourage, though much also to discourage him.

The Non-intrusion question in Scotland must be settled: a state of permanent collision between the law and the Church is a state which cannot be permitted. Such diseases become chronic, and therefore doubly dangerous to the whole social system.

The Irish Protestant Church must be protected, encouraged, and nurtured: all real Protestants admit and feel this; for they acknowledge our great obligations to that part of the Established Church of the realms.

The unhappy divisions which exist in the Catholic Church of that part of the British dominions called England, must be to him a source of unfeigned sorrow; but by the wise appointment of bishops, and the distribution of patronage amongst those who are no lovers of innovations and changes, a vast moral influence will be exercised over the younger clergy, who will feel that the mode of obtaining posts of increased influence and importance, is not by exciting heart-burnings and strife about new opinions and religious novelties.

The Church-rate question, so much agitated by the Dissenters, will die a natural death, if the Government shall refuse to interfere: the common law of the land is in favour of the rate. Common sense and decency are with the common law: morals and religion sanction both. Besides this, the respectable portions of Dissenters stand aloof from the "brawl;" and the courts of justice, both civil and ecclesiastical, are unanimous in their decisions: no statute is necessary—no enquiry should be consented to. The churches are the property of the nation, and the nation, as a nation, must repair its own churches.

Our opinion as to Church Extension is well known. We leave the time and the mode to the Government; but we are happy to concur with the *Morning Herald* and the *Churchman* in their vindication of the necessity for a parliamentary grant.

The establishment of a national system of Education is a topic to which Sir ROBERT PEEL will be expected to direct his early attention; and we are convinced that when he does do so, whilst every due and just attention will be paid to the religious opinions and scruples of the poorest of her Majesty's subjects, it will never be forgotten that we have a national Church—a national creed—and a national clergy.

The birth of the Prince of Wales is an event which we hail with delight, and for which we would desire to feel the most profound gratitude. It will not, we hope, be forgotten, that on the occasion of such an event it is customary to do more than record in the *Gazette* a truly liberal and un-party *brevet*. There has, during the last seven years, been gradually introduced into the House of Lords a number of peers of more than Whig tendencies: they are Whigs, and *something more*! It is time that Conservative merit should be rewarded—Conservative rank be advanced—and Conservative families be at least placed on an equality with those who have more destructive tendencies. The House of Lords is the great national rampart of the Constitution against the attacks of unbridled Democracy and unrestrained Radicalism. It is right and wise that its character should be kept up.

The State of the Nation, though greatly discouraging in some respects, still by no means justifies despondency, much less despair. We confess that if the men who were expelled from office by the thinking and sound part of the British electoral body had remained another year in power, we should not only have desponded, but even despaired. When the moral and religious character of a nation is left disregarded, and when the immoral and irreligious character of the Government is such as to exercise a corrupting influence over society, then, unless such a Government be removed, the nation gives evidence of a deplorable and awful acquiescence. In like manner, when the staple interests of the country, both manufacturing and agricultural, are neglected by a Government, either *it* must be overthrown, or *they* will share that fate. But these times have gone by, and right thankful we are that they have so. We have now no longer a *shuffling*, but an *honest Government*. If we have difficulties to meet, they must be met. If we have a crisis to go through of a severe and trying character, it must be gone through with honour and with spirit. If there are *temporary measures*

7

of alleviation to propose, they must be seconded and carried into immediate execution. If there are *permanent* measures of redress to bring forward, they will be submitted to Parliament, examined, and adopted. **WE HAVE A MAJORITY!** Yes, but a majority for *good*, and not for *evil*. The Whig-Radical Government of Lord MELBOURNE had a majority too, and for some years; but what vast measures of practical relief to the people came out of that majority? Not *one*!

WE HAVE! A MAJORITY! Yes, not only in Parliament, but in the nation; for the nation desires that the condition of the working classes should be ameliorated; and so do we! The nation desires that all *real* impediments to the advancement of manufactures should be removed; and so do we! The nation desires that all the great leading interests of the country should be equally attended to, and not one to the exclusion of the rest; and so do we! The nation desires to see the Government strong, decisive, paternal, and conciliatory; and so do we! The nation desires to see our foreign alliances made to bear on our manufacturing and commercial interests; and so do we! The nation desires that the Church of England and Ireland, as well as the Scottish communion, should set the edifying example of obedience to the laws, and opposition to innovation; and so do we! The nation desires that our colonies should be peopled by our own surplus population, and rendered prosperous and happy; and so do we! The nation desires peace, order, and liberty; and so do we!

Yes, **WE HAVE A MAJORITY!** but it is for *good*, and not for *evil*; and therefore the majority will be permanent.

THE NATION WILL RIGHT HERSELF!

Ecclesiastical Report.

THAT we have passed through a season of imminent peril, both to our Church and to our country, is a fact which no reflecting person can deny; and that our prospects are now more propitious than they have been during the last seven years is equally manifest. Under the guidance of Sir Robert Peel we can repose with more comfort and safety than under the rule of Lord Melbourne and his Whig supporters. At all events, the Church of England will find a supporter in the right honourable baronet; while the acts of the noble peer and his colleagues were those of men hostile to the welfare of that Church, which, as ministers of state, they were solemnly pledged to support. Feeling, then,

that we have experienced a change for the better, we wish now to direct the attention of our readers to some matters connected with our Church and her prospects under the present Government.

We have seen some publications of the Protestant Association, and we would offer a word of advice to the Committee, on their assertion that certain Jesuits have actually been ordained in the Anglican Church. The Society or the Committee have stated the thing as a fact with which they are acquainted. Now we simply deny the statement; and we assert that they have no evidence whatever to allege in support of their extraordinary assertion. The individual who penned the passage might, under the influence of an over-heated imagination, believe that such was the case; but he ought not to have stated his knowledge of *the fact*, when he had nothing but conjecture and his own suspicions to rest upon. The whole Society, however, are implicated in the transaction; and, as honourable men, its members are bound to come forward and disclaim the statement, in order that the odium may rest only on the anonymous writer. We would not say that such a thing is impossible; but we do say that it is so highly improbable, that its occurrence is next to an impossibility. The writer is probably ignorant of the various steps which must be taken by every man before he can enter into HOLY ORDERS. He may, perhaps, refer to the reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I. for instances; but we would merely remark, that the various checks to the admission of improper men into the Church are now very different from those which existed at that period. The cause of truth is not served by such defenders.

The daily press has been very busy in its conjectures as to particular measures to be introduced by the Government; and, among other things, it has been stated, that Sir Robert Peel intends to institute an order of *suffragan bishops*, who are to be placed, as bishops elect, in our most extensive sees, to which they are to succeed at the death of the present possessors. We at once declare our disbelief in the statement. Sir Robert Peel may see it necessary to divide some of the larger dioceses, and to erect new bishoprics; but we are quite sure that he cannot contemplate the placing of a second bishop in every diocese, as a sort of *rising sun*, to the disparagement of the old diocesan. Such a system could never be carried into operation; and sure we are that Sir Robert Peel is too wise a man to entertain so absurd a project. If it be asked, is nothing, then, to be done to relieve our bishops in extensive sees? we reply, that the Church has herself made provision for the very thing in her

appointment of suffragan bishops—not bishops elect, but bishops under the sole direction of the actual diocesans. The suffragan bishops whom the Church recognizes would not necessarily succeed to the episcopal chair on a vacancy. They might, on the death of a diocesan (we use the term here by way of distinction from a suffragan), be promoted to the vacancy, if the Crown should think proper; but otherwise they would retain their posts as assistants (being actual bishops in the Church, but not peers in Parliament), just as our archdeacons, who continue in their office for life. An archdeacon is appointed by one bishop, and he may survive several of the successors in the see, yet still he continues in his office. A suffragan bishop would be in a similar position. The statute of 26th Henry VIII. permits the appointment of *twenty-six* suffragan bishops, fixing the places in which they are to reside; so that it cannot be urged that the Church has made no provision in the case of large sees. As the law now stands suffragans may be appointed; and if Sir Robert Peel would recommend the Crown to revive the order, not appoint a new order of bishops elect, he would confer a most essential benefit upon the Church and the country at large. We trust, therefore, that the foolish rumour about coadjutors, as bishops elect, may actually be productive of some good in directing the attention of the Government to the revival of suffragan bishops in every diocese.

The subject of Church discipline is one which may probably engage the attention of the Government during the next session. Already some material changes have been effected in the administration of discipline: but every year shows the necessity of some further measures on the subject. Many of the evils under which we labour in this respect are the growth of time, and might easily be rectified. Something therefore will, we trust, be attempted: at the same time care must be taken not to degrade the Church, by placing the powers which she herself should exercise in the hands of the secular courts. Indeed, we do not believe, that her Majesty's Government would introduce any measure affecting the interests of the Church, without first obtaining the sanction of the archbishops and bishops.

On the subject of appointments to livings by the Crown and the Government, we wish to remark, that we have the strongest guarantee that efficient and active parish priests will be selected by her Majesty's Ministers. This is a very important question. Not only has the Government for the time being the appointment of the bishops, but also of a large number of the parochial clergy. Time was when men were appointed by interest; but that time, we trust, has passed away: at all events, we are not apprehensive of any such proceedings under the present Govern-

ment. We sincerely wish to suggest, therefore, that the men selected for vacant livings should be good parish priests. The clergy at this moment have a hold upon the affections of the people, which all the efforts of Radicalism cannot weaken. And whence does it arise but from their conduct as parish priests? The clergy are the friends of the poor, who naturally apply to the parochial minister in any season of need or of difficulty. Even the Dissenters, in their distress, frequently betake themselves to the clergyman of the parish.

In selecting men for the episcopal bench, or for parochial appointments, two classes of person are especially to be avoided by any Government which really seeks the welfare of the Church: these classes are the advocates of the *Tracts for the Times* and the men of the *Latitudinarian school*. They are the *antipodes* of each other; but both are alike to be avoided by those who wish well to the Church. While the advocates of the *Tracts for the Times* go to one extreme, the *Latitudinarians* go to the other. While the former exalt the *sacraments*, for instance, into Saviours, the latter reduce them to mere nullities: and while the one party dwells so much on rites and ceremonies, that the weightier matters of the law are frequently forgotten, the other disregards them altogether. It cannot be denied that some men of the *Latitudinarian school* were promoted by the late Government. Both, then, are to be avoided, since both are enemies to the Anglican Church. It is, however, necessary that we should explain ourselves respecting the advocates of the Tracts. Now we do not mean those gentlemen who concur to a certain extent in the views of the Tracts, for many, very many of those views are sound; but we refer to those who go the whole length of Tract 90, and of the other objectionable ones—those who agree with the article on Sir Robert Peel in the *British Critic*—an article which is a disgrace to the man who wrote it: these are the men whom we would include in our exclusion from preferment in the Anglican Church. That the present Government will avoid both these extremes in their appointments, we are convinced; and we cannot but think that the obnoxious article in the *British Critic* has been of essential service in opening the eyes of the public to the real character of the men. It was an incautious article, and we know that it is so viewed by some of the party; but we rejoice that the editor did not reject it, and that it was permitted to come forth at that peculiar juncture, when a Conservative Administration was coming into power.*

* Happily the two classes to whom we have alluded are few in number—few, we mean, when contrasted with the great body of the clergy, who steer their course, just as the Church herself does, between these two extremes.

The question of Church extension is one which must soon force itself on the attention of the Government. We would not, however, conceal from our readers, that a public grant of money may be objected to by some persons on conscientious grounds. Still we are convinced that every facility for extending the benefits of our Church Establishment will be afforded by her Majesty's Ministers. This subject has so often been dwelt upon in preceding numbers, that it is unnecessary to dwell upon it now. We would, however, remark, that the Government must have time: if, therefore, nothing be done in the approaching session, let not Churchmen conclude that the question is abandoned. Time is necessary; nor is it possible to accomplish everything in a short space. Some questions must be postponed, and it would be unreasonable to be dissatisfied because they are not taken up in the order in which we ourselves could wish.

We do, therefore, most sincerely congratulate the members of the Anglican Church in general, and the clergy in particular, on the change in the Government, which has led to the formation of a Conservative Administration. We congratulate them because we feel that the change will be for the good of the country and the welfare of the Church: and we most earnestly exhort all our readers to give their unqualified support to the present Government; nay, we urge it upon them as a duty; for if they love the Church of their fathers—that Church which was watered with the blood of the martyrs, and which the Whigs and Radicals would destroy, it is certainly incumbent on them to give their support to the present Administration, until, by some act or acts, it shall prove itself unworthy of their confidence.

THE OXFORD POETRY PROFESSORSHIP.

A more important question, inasmuch as it is a question not of men, but of principles, than that which is to be decided in Oxford, in the month of February, was never agitated in the University or in the Church. Were it a question of men we should abstain from any remark, since both the candidates are, as far as the Professorship of Poetry is concerned, well qualified for the vacant post: but in this case there is a great principle involved; nor is it possible to contemplate the consequences which might ensue from the appointment of such a man as Mr. Williams. Our readers will remember the censure passed by the Hebdomadal Board on the Tract No. 90. They will also remember the course pursued by Dr. Hook, at Leeds, at a meeting of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The reverend doctor was prevented, by his diocesan, from per-

sisting in a line of observation quite irrelevant to the object for which the meeting was convened; but he speedily embraced the opportunity of communicating his sentiments to the public through the medium of the press. It will be recollected that he expressed his firm belief, that the decision of the Hebdomadal Board would not be sanctioned by the Convocation of the University, were that body permitted to assemble. Should the Convocation select Mr. Williams to fill the vacant chair, Dr. Hook's position will be established, and the views contained in Tract 90 must then be regarded as confirmed by the majority of the University. An opportunity, therefore, is now presented for testing the assertions of those who were dissatisfied with the decision of the Hebdomadal Board. Two gentlemen have offered themselves as candidates—one supported by the Heads of Houses generally, as well as by the majority of the resident members of Convocation; the other by Dr. Pusey, and, of course, by all those who concur in the opinions advocated in the *Tracts for the Times*.

Some persons there are, as is evident from Lord Dungannon's Letter, who intend to give their vote without reference to the principles of the men, and simply on the ground of their supposed qualifications for the vacant chair. On such a ground, therefore, a man who is hostile to the principles of the Tracts may give his vote to Mr. Williams in preference to Mr. Garbett, supposing that, in his estimation, the former is the better poet. We cannot but consider that such a course is highly objectionable. It cannot be denied that Dr. Pusey, Mr. Newman, and their friends, would regard Mr. Williams's success as the triumph of the principles of the Tracts. Nor would such a conclusion be adopted only by themselves: on the contrary, the country at large would arrive at the same conclusion: the people would consider that the principles of the Tracts were adopted by the majority of the members of Convocation; for they would naturally argue that such must be the case, or Mr. Williams would never have been selected to fill an important post in the University. To act, therefore, on the principle involved in Lord Dungannon's Letter would ensure the success of Mr. Williams; and his success must fasten the views of the Tracts on the majority of the University. In our opinion, no man who objects to the doctrines of the Tracts can give his vote for Mr. Williams.

But we affirm that Mr. Williams is not better qualified for the post than Mr. Garbett. The former, indeed, is the author of some few poetical effusions; but they are not of so much merit as to place him in the first rank, before all competitors. We

wish not by any means to detract from Mr. Williams's poetical reputation ; all we intend to assert is this, namely, that his publications are not of such a character as to settle the question, and to place him in the chair of poetry in preference to Mr. Garbett. No one can complain of Mr. Garbett's unfitness ; and were Mr. Williams to retire no contest would take place. On this ground, therefore—the ground of Mr. Williams's publications, we cannot see that his claims can reasonably be preferred before those of his opponent. The Principal of Brazen Nose, in his reply to Dr. Pusey, enters on the merits of Mr. Garbett, in such terms as can leave no doubt in the mind of any person of his qualifications for the post :—

“Mr. Garbett's talents are admitted by all who know him. His acquirements in every department of literature are extensive. He is intimately acquainted with the poetry of most countries and ages. He has a singular power of retaining and combining all that he has ever read, and of developing his own systematized views to the apprehension of others.”

We believe that no one can question the justice of the above extract. He was also at one time tutor of his college, and also one of the public examiners in the University. About his fitness, therefore, there can be no question whatever ; so that we shall dismiss this point without any further remark.

Taking it for granted, therefore, that Mr. Garbett is quite as eligible a candidate as Mr. Williams, we would again press upon members of Convocation the point with which we started, namely, that this is a question of principles, and not of men. Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman are anxious to wipe off the stigma inflicted by the decision of the Hebdomadal Board, in their condemnation of Tract 90 ; and their object will be completely gained in the event of Mr. Williams's success, inasmuch as a vote of Convocation is more important than a vote of the Heads of Houses. Two things, therefore, are to be kept in view in this contest : *first*, to secure the post for Mr. Garbett ; the *second*, to keep Mr. Williams's minority as low as possible. It will not be sufficient merely to place Mr. Garbett in the Professor's Chair ; it will be necessary also to secure him such a majority that Mr. Williams's minority may not appear to advantage in the contrast. If the advocates of the Tracts cannot gain their end of placing Mr. Williams in the chair, which they can scarcely expect, they will muster all their forces, in order that the country at large may see that their numbers are increasing, and that they are by no means despicable as a party when contrasted with those to whom they are opposed. Surely it is desirable to prevent even such a realization of their wishes as this. The effect would be most

mischievous; and many, who at present may be wavering, would be induced to make their choice, and to swell those numbers which are already too great. The advocates of the Tracts are most anxious for an opportunity of exhibiting the number of their forces; and no occasion could suit them better than this, especially if they can succeed in swelling their numbers by gaining the votes of some, on the ground that a man's principles are not at all to be regarded in a question like the present.

It is often stated by such men as Dr. Hook, that the decision of the Hebdomadal Board would be reversed in Convocation; and we know, too, that the same opinion is entertained by many of the opponents of the Tracts. We are convinced that the opinion is a groundless one, and we are content to take the present contest as a test, provided the members of Convocation will take the trouble to come to the vote. The advantage on the side of the Tractarians is obvious to all members of the University. It is usual, for instance, for many persons to remove their names from the books of the University after some few years have elapsed from their degree, so that they have no vote in contests like the present. Many during the last ten years, the period of the existence of the Tracts, have lost their vote in the manner above mentioned; but they are all on one side, namely, on the side of the opponents of the Tracts. During the last ten years, few, if any, of the advocates of the Tracts have removed their names from the boards; so that they will be able to bring all their forces to the contest, and to make a show of all their strength; while hundreds of clergymen and others who are opposed to them have lost their vote by the course to which we have alluded. It may, therefore, be fairly assumed, that the men who may be brought to vote for Mr. Williams will constitute the entire strength of the party, since few have removed their names from the boards. They will enter into the contest under no disadvantage; they will accomplish what they have long wished, namely, a demonstration of their numbers.

Still we are ready to meet them; nor are we fearful for the result. On the contrary, we are convinced that their numbers, even under circumstances so favourable to their object, will be small—so small, indeed, that many persons will be surprised that such an insignificant body of men should have made so much noise and attracted so much attention. We, indeed, predict the happiest consequences from the contest. Those persons who are dreadfully alarmed at the alleged numbers of the supporters of the Tracts will be astonished to find that they are so inconsiderable. That such will be the result is our decided con-

viction; and consequently, so far from viewing the contest with alarm, we contemplate its approach with feelings of pleasure.

But the members of Convocation must be active; they must make up their minds to record their votes. To avoid the trouble of a journey to Oxford, on the ground that Mr. Williams has no chance of success, would tend to make the relative difference between the majority and the minority less considerable than it ought to be, or than it will be, if members are faithful to their important trust. Besides, if the Tractarians bring up all their forces, while their opponents only secure the presence of a sufficient number to ensure a majority, not only will the relative strength of the parties be misunderstood, but the impression will be created in the country that the members of Convocation, though not actually Tractarians, are, to say the least, very lukewarm on a subject in which all their energies ought to be enlisted.

On every account, therefore, it is necessary that every man who has a vote should make it a point of conscience to appear in Oxford on the day of election. The Tractarians have boasted of their success during the last ten years, for it is just ten years since the Tracts were commenced; they also predict greater success during the next ten years. It is somewhat singular that the Professor of Poetry is chosen for *ten years*, at the close of which term he resigns his seat. If, then, the gentlemen in question could, on the ground that principles were not involved in the contest, succeed in obtaining a majority, the advantage gained by the election of one of their own party, arising from the impression on the public mind of their importance as a body, together with the influence which would be derived from the actual possession of the Professor's Chair, would add such an accelerating force to the tide in their favour, that their prediction respecting the next ten years would probably be accomplished.

Let it also be remembered that Mr. Williams is not merely supported by the Tractarians as a party, but that he is actually the author of one of the most obnoxious of the Tracts, that on "*Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge.*" We are convinced that no sound member of the Anglican Church can bring himself to vote for Mr. Williams, if he will only take the trouble to peruse that Tract. We therefore recommend all the members of Convocation to peruse it; and to those who are wavering, or who are inclined to support Mr. Williams, on the ground that no principle is involved, we say that they will not be acting consistently, as Churchmen, if they do not give it an attentive perusal.

These pages may be read by many members of Convocation residing in distant parts of the country, and who may be scarcely aware of the importance of the approaching contest. To such individuals we would insist on the necessity of recording their votes. Let all who are anxious for the welfare of the Church, and who consequently are convinced of the dangerous errors contained in the Tracts, come forward, as in the path of duty, and the result will be such as will satisfy every sound member of our national Zion.

THE BISHOP OF THE UNITED CHURCH IN JERUSALEM.

Jerusalem is the place towards which the musings of every Christian must frequently wander. There the Lord of glory was crucified: there the first Church was planted: and thence did the sound of the Gospel of peace issue forth, until it reached our own favoured land. It must, therefore, be a pleasing subject of contemplation, that a bishop of our own Church should be established in God's ancient city, to exercise authority over the members of our own communion, as well as to open communications with the Churches of the East—those Churches planted by the apostles, and which have never submitted to the intolerable yoke of the Church of Rome.

This question of a Bishop of Jerusalem has given rise to much discussion. Some persons have considered the act as an invasion of the privileges of the bishop of another Church. Were such the case, we should be among the most strenuous opposers of the scheme. We, however, view the matter in a totally different light; and our opinion is borne out by that of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The bishop who is gone to Palestine will merely be the representative of the United Church in that country: as such, he will maintain a friendly intercourse with the eastern bishops, who will be able, through this medium, to become better acquainted with our apostolic origin, as well as our apostolic worship and discipline. Notwithstanding, therefore, the apprehensions which some parties have expressed on this subject, we feel assured that, when the matter is fully understood, no right-minded person will refuse to concur in a measure which the eastern bishops themselves have long called for, and which the circumstances of our own members in the east imperatively demand. The Archbishop of Canterbury could not condescend to notice the various statements put forth by the daily press, or a few words from his Grace would have dissipated all those mists in which the question has, whether from design or from ignorance, been involved. To insinuate that the appointment of a bishop to reside at Jerusalem, and to exercise autho-

city over British Christians in the east, was an invasion of the diocese of another bishop, involved a reflection on the Metropolitan which no act of his Grace's could warrant. Has he ever evinced a desire to act irregularly, or to invade the rights of other Churches? No one can specify a single act upon which any such interpretation can be put. Why then were such statements put forth and circulated, week after week, in the daily papers? To say the least of such a course, it was highly disrespectful to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, as well as to the Bishop of London, and others who were consulted in the arrangement.

We may observe that no new see has been established in this case: that indeed would have been impossible in a country subject to another government; or, if possible, it would be undesirable: but to send out a bishop as our representative in the east was surely a legitimate step; and it was quite competent to our Government to prescribe the bounds within which he shall exercise the duties of his office. This is all that has been done by the heads of the Church. It is, moreover, a remarkable fact, especially when viewed in connexion with the objections to which we have alluded, that no less than *five* oriental prelates have applied to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London for protection and assistance. We would ask how the intercourse can be maintained between these and other eastern bishops, except by the establishment of a prelate of our own Church in the east, as our representative, to whom and through whom all communications may be made to the Metropolitan? It appears that of the eight bishops in the patriarchate of Jerusalem, seven actually reside in the convents at Jerusalem; so that Bishop Alexander will necessarily be in constant communication with those prelates. Surely it is desirable that we should hold intercourse with a Church as ancient as our own, or as Rome, and over which the Papal see has never exercised authority! On every account, therefore, we hail the appointment of an English bishop to reside in the holy city; and we cannot but think that the heads of the Church have exercised a wise discretion in the appointment of a Jew to that important office.

With regard to the title by which our bishop in Jerusalem is designated, we have a word or two to offer. It appears that some difficulty was experienced in the matter. To have entitled him Bishop of Jerusalem, or Bishop of Palestine, would have been highly improper, inasmuch as the territory is in the possession of a foreign state, and there is actually a patriarch who exercises authority over the whole of Palestine. In these

circumstances it was at first decided that he should be styled "*The Bishop of the Church of St. James at Jerusalem.*" This designation, in our opinion, was highly objectionable; for it actually reduced our bishop to a mere presbyter, by making him the bishop of a particular congregation. Even the Presbyterians have no objection to the name of a bishop; but they contend that the only bishops known in the early Church were pastors of particular congregations, and not bishops with jurisdiction over several or many churches. So the Congregationalists, or Independents, among our Dissenters, have no objection to the name: they contend, as the Presbyterians do, that the primitive bishop was simply the pastor of a single congregation. If, then, the above designation had been adopted, it would have given some countenance to the Presbyterian and Congregational notion; for, according to his title, Bishop Alexander would have been a simple pastor over a single congregation. We think, therefore, that the right title has been adopted, and that all difficulties are removed. Even the parties who raised so many objections to the appointment must be satisfied with the whole of the proceedings relative to this important matter.

THE BIRTH OF A PRINCE.

We are sure that our readers will see the propriety of noticing such an auspicious event, as the birth of an heir to the throne of these realms, in an Ecclesiastical Report, especially as it was followed by a purely ecclesiastical act, the appointment of a "Form of Thanksgiving," to be used in all the churches in the land. That our Queen and the Prince may be preserved is the sincere prayer of every member of the Anglican Church. It was a most gratifying circumstance that a special thanksgiving should have been offered up to Almighty God in all our churches. Sure we are that none of the vast multitudes who attended our churches were indifferent observers on that occasion. Many prayers, as well as thanksgivings, were presented to Heaven for the protection of our Queen and the Prince: and we are assured that all the members of the Anglican Church will not cease to supplicate blessings on the heads of both.

We are anxious, however, to offer a remark on the subject of the place in which this holy sacrament will be celebrated. In the case of the Princess Royal, baptism was administered in a private room in the Palace. Now we are certain that our gracious Queen, as the head of our Church, is most anxious to comply with all the directions of that Church. One of those directions is, that the children of her members should be admitted into the Church in the public assembly. We rejoice, therefore, to learn

that the baptism of the Prince is to be celebrated in a consecrated place, according to the directions of that Church of which her Majesty is supreme governor.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION.

The suppression of certain canonries and prebends in our cathedrals and collegiate churches has placed a considerable sum at the disposal of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. It is proposed that this sum should be devoted to the augmentation of small benefices. On the propriety or impropriety of suppressing any of the establishments connected with our cathedrals, we shall not here offer an opinion. The measure is actually carried, and we will hope for the best. But respecting the propriety of disposing of the funds arising from the suppressions in the augmentation of poor benefices, no difference of opinion can exist among Churchmen. A scheme, therefore, has been prepared by the commissioners, by which the distribution is to be regulated. In the schedule annexed to the scheme no less than *ninety-three* benefices are specified, to which an annual grant is to be made, so that the net income of each may be a clear sum of 150*l.* per annum. The rule laid down by the commissioners is this—to select those livings which are below the sum of 150*l.* per annum, and which have districts containing a population of *two thousand souls*. As the funds arising from the suppressions are increased, the commissioners are empowered to extend their bounty to other classes. We hope, therefore, that in the course of a few years the incomes of many of the poor benefices, and especially of those in populous districts, will be so far increased as to allow the incumbents to live in comfort and respectability.

THE LORD MAYOR OF DUBLIN.

The corporation of Dublin was entirely Protestant until the recent change effected by the Municipal Bill: but at the present moment Mr. O'Connell is the Lord Mayor. He is the second Roman Catholic who has filled that office since the Reformation; the other instance having occurred in the year 1688, under a Popish sovereign. That Mr. O'Connell will effect more mischief as Lord Mayor of Dublin, than he did in his private capacity, we do not believe; but we cannot but regret the passing of a measure which has destroyed the Protestant character of the corporation. It remains to be seen whether the city of Dublin will be a gainer by the change. That no other concessions ought to be made to the Romanists, will, we think, be the view of all sound Protestants. Every previous concession has hitherto been abused; and we are convinced that the Municipal Bill

will also be abused by the Irish Papists. It is quite time for Protestants to make a stand; for if concession after concession continues to be made, in a very short time nothing will be left to concede.

CHURCH-RATES.

We introduce this question into the present report merely to notice an important decision in the Consistory Court, on the 10th of November. It relates to the parish of Braintree, concerning which there has been so much litigation. It will also be remembered, that, by the decision of the Court of Exchequer, the churchwardens and a minority of the vestry may levy a rate for necessary repairs, even against a majority. A vestry was called in this turbulent parish. The churchwardens produced an estimate of the expenses for the repair of the fabric, and a rate of *two shillings* in the pound was proposed and seconded. An amendment, however, to the effect that compulsory payments *for the support of the services of any religious sect* are unsanctioned by the New Testament, with much more twaddle about the rights of conscience, was carried by a large majority. The majority refusing to make the necessary rate, the churchwardens, and other rate-payers forming the minority, made the rate, which was signed by the vicar, churchwardens, and others: the rate was also confirmed by the court. After this decision the churchwardens waited on Mr. Burder, the individual who has acted so conspicuous a part in the Braintree case; he refused, however, to pay: a citation to appear and show cause why he refused was served upon him; and shortly after his brother-in-law came to the churchwardens to pay the rate, as a friend: they refused to take the rate without the expenses, and these also were paid. Thus it is that the Dissenters are getting out of the scrape into which they had plunged themselves. They declare that they will never pay; a friend is procured to pay for them: and thus they imagine that they can avoid a prison without incurring the heavy charge of *lying*. We trust a similar process will be adopted by the churchwardens in every parish in which the rate is refused.

Other subjects of considerable importance must be omitted from want of space, especially the proceedings of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. These matters, with others which cannot now be discussed, will be entered upon in our next number. In the mean time we beg to direct the serious attention of our readers to the various important subjects which we have now submitted to their notice.

General Literature.

Nuces Philosophicæ. By E. Johnson. London: Simpkin and Marshall; Ipswich: J. M. Burton. 1841.

THE concluding words of the noted Horne Tooke's celebrated work are these: "We may still perhaps find time enough for a farther conversation on this subject; and finally, if the times will bear it, to apply this system of language to all the different systems of metaphysical—that is, verbal—imposture." This is the task which Mr. Johnson has set himself—to complete Horne Tooke's uncompleted philosophy. In the execution of this task, he has completely succeeded in sweeping, what is ordinarily called, metaphysics, with all its mystical trumpery, from the list of human sciences. When Horne Tooke, however, penned the above passage, he little dreamed that one would arise to execute the task which he had thus promised himself, who, while rigidly adhering to his system of language and philosophical principles, does, by that very adherence, totally overturn his *political* doctrines. Mr. Johnson, however, turning Horne Tooke's own weapons against himself, clearly shows the rottenness of his political creed, by proving the soundness of his philosophical principles. The cause of Conservatism will derive arguments from this work which nothing can shake.

Take, as an abstract of the manner in which he scatters metaphysical cobwebs to the winds, his mode of treating "ideas:"—

"There is no such thing as an idea (says he) in *rerum naturâ*. The word *idea* is a Greek past participle, and merely signifies *seen*—something *seen*. To say one has *no idea of an elephant*, is simply to say one *has never seen* an elephant; while, to say one has or possesses an idea of an elephant, is merely a trick of language, and means nothing more than that one has *seen*, or, as he might say if he chose, has had a *sight* of an elephant. Things produce certain effects upon certain parts of our nervous system, called seeing, hearing, feeling, &c., when it (the nervous system) is brought within the sphere of their operation upon it. The word *idea* merely indicates, with regard to one or more particular things, that the nervous system (or organs of sense) has been brought within the sphere of their operation, and that they have produced their natural effects accordingly. *Why* things should have power to produce those effects called seeing, hearing, &c., we do not know: but yet we know *quite* as much about this as we do about any other causes whatever. No man, for instance, can tell the *cause* why matter attracts matter—why a stone falls to the ground—that is, the *cause* of

gravitation. All we know about the matter is, that we see it is *so*. And we know as much as this about the cause of seeing, hearing, tasting, &c. No one supposes there is a separate, independent, abstract existence, called *gravitation*. Why (enquires our author) should they suppose any such abstract existence to be represented by the word *idea*? Any argument which would prove the one would prove the other. Bring a glass within the sphere of operation of a stone, and it will produce on the glass that effect we call a crack. But would any man in his senses suppose the word *crack* to represent an independent, abstract existence, or any existence of any kind? It was a pane of glass before—it is a pane of glass still: the only difference is, that an alteration has been effected in the relation of its parts, which causes an alteration in the mode in which it impresses our senses. Before, it was a pane of glass—whole: now, it is a pane of glass—cracked;—the word *cracked* merely indicating a change in the relation of its parts, and the manner of its existence. There is no third existence indicated by the word *crack*, any more than there would be by the word wholeness, supposing there was such a word. It is the same with *idea*. The word merely indicates a change in the relation between ourselves and other things. Before a man has seen an elephant, the relation between the man and the elephant is one which will not permit the elephant to impress his organs: after he has seen it, he says he possesses an *idea* of an elephant. The word *idea*, like the word *crack*, merely indicates a change of relation, and informs the hearer that a relation has been established which has enabled that thing called an elephant to impress his organs—in one word, that he has *seen* an elephant—that an elephant has become to him a *seen* thing, instead of an *unseen* thing.”

The simplicity and clear intelligibility of this doctrine is of itself almost sufficient to command assent at once.

“Every word (says he) *must* be the sign, directly or indirectly, of some sensible object, otherwise it cannot possibly perform (as he clearly proves) the office of a word—it cannot possibly become a communicating medium between man and man. No two men can possibly know that they two use the *same sign* for the *same* thing, unless that thing have an existence in *rerum natura*, and can be referred to by the senses as the standard by which to *settle* the meaning of that word, and prove that two men or twenty do use the same sign for the same thing.”

As he treats the word *idea*, so does he numerous others—time, space, distance, sensation, mind, intellect, thing, think, right, justice, memory, belief, existence, be, better, good, being, causation, duty, essence, judgment, knowledge, meaning, qua-

lity, reason, substance, truth, will, &c. &c.—reducing every one of them to a clear and intelligible meaning, and showing that they are all either the names of sensible objects, or the signs of other words, or participles with a subaddition of the word *thing*.

As *idea* is the Greek past participle, signifying a *seen* thing, so *mind* is an Anglo-Saxon past participle, signifying *remembered* things. As the phrase “I possess ideas” merely means “I have seen things,” so the phrase “I possess a *mind*” merely signifies “I remember things.” As *mind*, therefore, signifies *remembered things*, so *remembered things* is but another expression for knowledge, since a man can know nothing which he does not remember, or which he has *forgotten*.

And as *mind* signifies whatever a man *remembers*, so *knowledge* signifies whatever a man has *gotten*, that is, through his senses—Mr. Johnson deriving *know* from γινῶσκω.

On the subject of *mind* (in the Preface), in order to confirm his assertion that it means *knowledge*, he makes several quotations from Bagster’s “Hexapla,” which prove, beyond doubt, that the word was used in that sense by the early translators of the Bible.

Mr. Johnson’s etymology of the word *think*, and his account of the operation of *thinking*, is exceedingly beautiful, clear, and simple, and, we should conceive, cannot leave a doubt upon the mind of any intelligent reader.

The word *right* introduces what he calls “moral mathematics” and “political mathematics.” He treads with the most careful accuracy, from beginning to end, in the steps of “the mighty master,” Horne Tooke. And it is curious to observe how straight is the path along which these conduct him directly to the great principles of Conservatism, instead of his master’s wild, incoherent, impossible democraticisms. Our author exposes, with an irresistible clearness, the fallacy and folly, as well as the mischief and misery, which has resulted, and is daily resulting, from the insane outcry in favour of attempting the indiscriminate and unlimited education of the multitude. “First (says he), it is impossible; and, secondly, if it were possible, it could be productive of nothing but unhappiness.”

As he has treated the words *idea* and *mind*, so has he treated the word *right*, and shown incontestably that there are no such things as those loudly vaunted and much talked of things (which are no things) called “political rights,” the “rights of the people,” &c. And if what he says of ideas and mind be true, then what he says of the word *right* must be true also.

There are some things in this work calculated to shock, at first sight, a few of our long cherished principles. But Mr. Johnson

shows that this can only be the case with superficial thinkers, and that there is nothing in his philosophy which is at variance with the natural relation between man and man, and those kindly feelings which cement society. He merely traces those feelings to their true source, and shows how a misunderstanding in this respect has become the parent of much, if not all, of our present distress. Mr. Johnson gives as little countenance to modern materialism as he does to ordinary metaphysics. His philosophy is that of a Christian, and capable of combining with the doctrines of Scripture, and with them alone.

After this, need we say, to all lovers of truth and common sense, "read the book?"

-
1. *The Omnipresence of the Deity*: with other Poems. By Robert Montgomery, M. A. Twenty-first edition. London: Baisler. 1841.
 2. *Woman*: with other Poems. By Robert Montgomery, M. A. Sixth edition. London: Baisler. 1841.
 3. *Satan; or, Intellect without God*: with other Poems. By Robert Montgomery, M. A. Tenth edition. London: Baisler. 841.

THE public need only to look at the words, twenty-first edition, sixth edition, and tenth edition, to be convinced that they, the public, are very much delighted, and justly so, with the poetry of Robert Montgomery. As we have not long ago recorded our opinion, at some length, on the works of this amiable and accomplished writer, we shall here only remark that the present edition is elegant and uniform, pleasant to read, and profitable to remember. We are anxiously looking for the forthcoming "Luther."

Lectures on Paley. London: Cadell. 1841.

SOMETIME ago we noticed a series of lectures on Locke, drawn up, like the present series on Paley, for the use of students in the University. What University? They are both—that is, both books—skilful condensations.

On the Sufficiency of the Parochial System, without a Poor-rate, for the right Management of the Poor. By Thomas Chalmers, D.D., LL.D. Glasgow: Collins. 1841.

WHATSOEVER Dr. Chalmers has done he has done well; and though we cannot agree with all the positions laid down in the present volume, it is one nevertheless highly deserving the attention of legislators and political economists.

Episcopacy and Presbytery. By the Rev. Archibald Boyd, M.A., Curate of the Cathedral of Derry. London: Seeleys. 1841.

As an able preacher and a sound doctrinal theologian, we have known Mr. Boyd a long time, and it is with great pleasure that we see his powerful mind turned to the question of Discipline. In the volume before us he has, with great skill and judgment, treated the whole difficult subject of the Episcopate and the Presbyterate, and has shown that every argument advanced on the side of our opponents is at once futile and sophistical. The claims made by Presbyterians to the advocacy of Stillingfleet, in his "*Irenicum*," are thus ably disposed of; nor do we think the reply admits of any further argument:—

"This question may be answered by a consideration of Stillingfleet's design in drawing up the '*Irenicum*.' His object was to effect an union between the different sections of Protestants in England; and to accomplish that object he was obliged to dispose of the obstacle to an accommodation, viz., the stumbling-block of Church government. To have taken up, as his proposition, that any form of Church government was of divine right, would have (in his view) defeated his design, inasmuch as that which traced up its origin to God could never, with principle, be altered or surrendered. His proposition, therefore, in the '*Irenicum*,' was, that *no form* of Church government was of divine right—that it was a matter rather of national or ecclesiastical convenience, than of divine appointment; and that, therefore, each of the discordant parties might so infringe upon their respective peculiarities as to stand upon a platform of accommodation. When it is recollected that Presbyterians assert their form of ecclesiastical polity to be divine, it is evident that they cannot claim Stillingfleet as a supporter of their opinions. In fact, as far as the '*Irenicum*' is concerned, this divine stood on neutral ground, a self-constituted mediator between parties, neither of whom he chose to displease by espousing the opposite peculiarities. To him, therefore, as the writer of the '*Irenicum*,' we affirm that Presbyterians, on their own principles, dare not appeal."

But as Stillingfleet's opinions did afterwards materially change, and as he was, when he wrote the "*Irenicum*," a very young man, we shall make a further quotation from Mr. Boyd's masterly production:—

"It may, however, be said, upon the other hand, that he is equally valueless as an authority for the Church of England. To this I reply, first, that this is not the point. He is at present considered, not as adduced by us, but as the witness of our opponents; and, as such, we ask them, we challenge them to produce one single passage from the pages of Stillingfleet in favour of Presbyterianism, as a divine institution. He may speak of it, for aught I recollect, with respect, as an ingenious human contrivance, but such a testimony will not avail the pleaders. If they cannot make their witness speak in terms more determinate than this, they have no business to cite him in their favour. But, secondly, I reply that I am constrained to do this eminent prelate that justice which the pleaders, with characteristic inadvertence, have omitted to do him. It may not, perhaps, be in the knowledge of the pleaders,

or, if it be, it has been carefully kept out of view, that Dr. Stillingfleet lived to repent of his mistakes, and to recant the erroneous principles on which the 'Irenicum' was built. It was not founded on truth, and therefore could not endure the scrutiny of even its parent's riper years and more matured judgment."

Nor does he leave the question here; and, as the authority of Stillingfleet is one which Dissenters of every grade are apt to bring forward, we shall allow Mr. Boyd to finish the argument, which he does thus:—

"Let our opponents hearken to his own confession. In the Preface of his work entituled 'The Unreasonableness of Separation from the Communion of the Church of England,' the author thus defends himself against the charge of changeableness of opinion advanced by his four antagonists—'Will you not allow one single person, who happened to write about these matters when he was very young, in twenty years' time, of the most busy and thoughtful part of his life, to see reason to alter his judgment?' And in the work itself, if the pleaders be desirous to see the real and confirmed views of this celebrated man, they may find these two propositions set forth as those he undertakes to establish—first, that *our diocesan episcopacy* is the same for substance which was *in the primitive Church*; and, secondly, that it is not repugnant to any institution of Christ's, nor devising a new species of Churches without God's authority. And if they please to look somewhat more in detail into his opinions, they may find that he undertakes to prove these points—'that the episcopal power succeeded the apostolical; and that the people's power of choosing their own pastors is not founded in Scripture.'"

We might, did our space permit, make many extracts equally important, but we must forbear. On one subject—that, viz., of the Apostolical Succession—we rejoice to find that Mr. Boyd has spoken out so plainly. We have been so often told that it is impossible for an evangelical Churchman to maintain it—that it was a rag of Popery, and a very large rag too—that it is a subject of no small congratulation to find an Irish clergyman—one, too, who necessarily sees Popery in its very worst form—so willing to separate Catholicism and Romanism; and while he allows no quarter to the latter, is yet earnestly contending for the faith, and also the "form of sound words" once delivered to the saints. In the fourth century the question of Ordination came formally before the Church, and was decided in favour of the *sole* right of Episcopacy:—

"We hold, then, that in this case of Colluthus the question of the competency of a presbyter to ordain was brought to a trial; that the Church disallowed such ordination; that the Church did not disallow it on the score of the ordainer's opinions, but upon the ground (sanctioned by Scripture, and defended by all the writers of antiquity) that a presbyter had no ordaining power in his commission, and that all done by him outside of his commission was not only informal, but invalid.

"A canon of the general council of Constantinople (A. D. 381) throws fuller light on the subject. It relates to the invalidation of all the acts

of Maximus, who was irregularly consecrated to that see by bishops unconnected with the province. We may assume that this person was a presbyter before his elevation to the episcopal station. When his case came to be treated of by the assembled bishops of this, the second general council, the canon passed in reference to it plainly indicates the necessary connection between ordination and episcopacy—"Be it decreed, that Maximus neither is, nor was, a bishop; nor are those ordained by him in any rank whatsoever of the clergy." The connection between the first and second clauses of this canon will be noted. The one appears to follow evidently as a consequence of the other, as if the Constantinopolitan prelates so associated ordination with a true elevation to the episcopal office, as to determine, that where the latter did not exist, the power of conferring the former did not exist. If so, the power of the mere presbyter to confer orders must be regarded as totally unrecognized by the general council of Byzantium."

We shall add to what we have already said, that we look at the publication of a work like this as at once a means and a proof of the rapid spread of true Church principle. On this ground we more especially rejoice at the perpetual appearance, and sometimes from rather unexpected quarters, of good sound books on Discipline, and among such this must hold a high place.

-
1. *Annotations on some of the Messianic Psalms, from the Commentary of Rosenmeeller.* Translated by Robert Johnson. (*Biblical Cabinet, XXXII.*) Edinburgh: Clark. 1841.
 2. *The Life of Christians during the first Three Centuries of the Church; a Series of Sermons on Church History.* By Dr. Chr. Ludw. Conard. Translated from the German by Leopold Bernays, Phil. D. (*Biblical Cabinet, XXXIII.*) Edinburgh: Clark.

THOSE whose attention is turned to German literature have long admired the extent and importance of German theology. That it has been, and still is, deformed by neology, is alas! a melancholy fact; but the editors of the "Biblical Cabinet" have taken care to select the most valuable works on divinity which Germany has produced; and we scarcely know a more acceptable series than that with which they have favoured the theological world. The two present volumes are at once interesting and important, well chosen and well translated.

A New English Grammar, &c. By Alexander Allen, Phil. D., and James Cornwall. Second edition. London: Simpkin and Marshall. 1841.

THE chief merit of this grammar—and it is no light merit—is, that it is written by one who is profoundly acquainted with the *sources* of our language, and who has brought this acquaintance to bear on its grammatical structure. This grammar will, we are convinced, make its way in schools.

Poems. By Thomas Powell. London: Wilson. 1841.

AMONG the many writers of verse whose productions deluge the market, in an age of pretension so enormous, and of performance so little, it is, as our friends at the lakes would say, "quite refreshing to meet with one who loves poetry for its own sake, and possesses not a little both of the strength and sweetness that distinguished the bards of old time." We have watched Mr. Powell with some care since his poetical rising, and we rejoice that we are able to give a decided opinion as to his merits. We now look on him as one well qualified to be a central pillar in the temple of the muses; and though we now and then detect what we think is rather a copying of Wordsworth than a copying of nature, yet Mr. Powell has, we are assured, only to be set on his guard, and he will do well. Not many living bards could produce so exquisitely beautiful a poem as the following:—

"They sleep—the green turf wraps them round ;
The turf is green throughout the year,
And violets grow upon each mound
To tell us spring is here.

"Yet vain to those who rest below
The hills rejoicing in the spring,
And silent all to them the flow
Of rivers murmuring.

"The early lark for them no more
Shall open morning with her song,
Teaching to all great Nature's lore—
To weak and strong—

"To rise up heavenward from the spot,
Which God has made our earthly home,
Never to leave one tie forgot,
Nor wish to roam.

"But ever on the unchanging sky
To fix the soul—the mind—the heart ;
And, when it is our time to die,
With joy depart."

Nor is the mixture of simplicity and sublimity less striking in—

"O, sovran lady ! when the choral voice
Of a glad nation rose in proud acclaim,
And the skies echoed with Victoria's name,
I was not one who swell'd the vast crowd's noise ;
But, in a quiet meadow far away,
I call'd on all things living to rejoice
In the sweet promise of thy golden sway.
For in thy reign, O mistress of the sea !
I recognize a brighter dawn on earth ;
Rejoice, ye millions of the human birth !

to shore and sea your happy songs resound ;
 or she, the empress of the great and free,
 gentle-hearted, and in her we see
 truth, beauty, womanhood, with power and glory crown'd."

There is no straining after effect, no searching for quaint and obsolete words. If the prevailing idea was not strong to support its own weight, and call around it words fit its vehicle, it is obliged to sink, and this is right. It is especially as a religious poet that we look upon Powell, and we see his verses filled, even to overflowing, with a very gentlest spirit of Christian love ; they seem to breathe an atmosphere, not merely of benevolence, but of affection. Who is there who cannot see and feel, in the following, the unaffected outpourings of a softened heart?—

"O, miserable age ! when right and wrong
 Are weighed in scales of artful argument,
 And the beam turned by the expedient.
 O, dwarfish age ! when slavish myriads throng
 To worship wars and folly, pride and gold ;
 Where vice is cherished, and sweet virtue sold—
 Where legislation wages devilish strife
 Against the poor—deeming it excellent
 To add to poverty (that sting of life !)
 Villanous insult ! thereby saving pence !
 Vile world ! in which the million still deride
 The sufferings of patient innocence,
 And where, alas ! as in the days of old,
 Pilate still reigns—and Christ is crucified."

We must conclude. We desire earnestly to assist in making the good book of a good man ; and we shall have done our service if we prevail upon him to peruse it for

Five Remarks on Modern Education. By E. L. London : Cadell. 1841.

These remarks are discursive, their title implies ; they are, *very* discursive ; at the same time they indicate right and advocate sound principles.

A Historical Poem. By J. Bell Worrell, Author of "Edgina." London : Houlston and Hughes. 1841.

Had society done to Mr. J. Bell Worrell that he should upon it another poem : surely *he* has not had a fever, or a fit. Let us make a bargain with him ; we are not inclined to be severe, so we will forgive him this once, if he will faithfully "never to do so again."

A Memoir of the Life and Ministry of the Rev. Watts Wilkinson, B.A.; with Extracts from his Correspondence. By Henry Watts Wilkinson, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Gregory and St. Peter, Sudbury, and late Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford. London: Seeleys. 1842.

AMONG the many personally remarkable and excellent men who have but lately departed from amongst us, few were more extensively known than the subject of this memoir. The venerable appearance of the aged minister—the occasional peculiarities of his doctrine—the affectionate earnestness of his manner—all tended to create an interest in him, which a closer acquaintance invariably increased. The life of this good man was quiet, and almost barren of incident; his biographer has little to do but to give occasional pictures of his religious feelings; and here, too, we will take occasion to observe, that though our views of election are widely different from those which the late Mr. Wilkinson would perhaps have called, and which his son certainly does call, “the doctrines of grace,” we can yet unhesitatingly acquit him of either teaching or holding Antinomian tenets.

“Decidedly opposed he was to every statement of doctrine which he considered as tending to any *Antinomian* perversion of the grace of God. Against the unscriptural notion of imputed sanctification, and the opinions of those who deny that the moral law is the grand rule of Christian obedience, with similar tenets, he ever bore a decided testimony. Nor was he less opposed to all those rash and equally unscriptural statements, with respect to the divine decrees, which some have not failed fearlessly and presumptuously to advocate. He never touched upon these *deep things of God* without the greatest caution and the deepest reverential awe. Hearers he might have had who were ready to put a *false construction* on some detached passages in his sermons, which might appear favourable to their own views, with respect to the points just referred to; or upon some rather strong expressions, which he occasionally adopted when combating errors of an opposite description. But so far were these tenets from forming any part of his system, that he frequently expressed, not merely his strong disapprobation, but his positive abhorrence of them.” (pp. 67, 68).

That what he did preach, on many occasions, might legitimately be carried out, by those inclined so to do, to that extent, is a fact which we do not deny; but we do deny that this truly pious man ever so carried them out himself, or allowed, so far as he could prevent it, any other persons to do so. An affecting instance of this is given by his son:—

“On one occasion, in particular, not many evenings before his death, when expressing to one of his sons his apprehension that he should not survive the night, and at the same time his simple dependence on the mercy of God in Christ, as if his mind was still dwelling on these topics, though no one present had attempted to bring them to his remembrance, he emphatically observed, ‘*There is no such thing as reprobation.*’ And after alluding to the opinion of President Edwards on that subject, in a

manner which plainly evinced the collected state of his mind, he immediately, and with much solemnity and emphasis, quoted the following words: 'The Lord, the Lord God, *merciful* and *gracious*, *long-suffering*, and *abundant* in goodness and truth.' "

He is now, we doubt not, satisfied that, whoever were pretermitted, he was not.

Mr. Wilkinson was a man free from what is expressively called *cant*; he wished to think well of others, and he *did so*. How he treated censoriousness and discontent may be beautifully instanced by a passage in one of his letters:—

"The latter part of your last letter, I acknowledge, distressed me much. With respect to 'bidding adieu to the Church and its lukewarm, selfish, men-pleasing ministers'—as you style some, whom I cannot but view as the excellent of the earth, and the lights of the world; to whom I esteem it my privilege to look up as examples here, and in whose lot I shall be happy to share hereafter—I cannot commend this: I do not like the *spirit* which it indicates; I am distressed to read it, and, for your *own sake*, I hope the threat will never be executed. And how astonished was I at what follows:—'Twenty-one years of service (you complain *in effect*) has not recommended me either to preferment or patron.' My dear friend, were *these* your objects when you entered upon the Gospel ministry? Are *these* the things you have been aiming at, while preaching Jesus Christ, and him crucified? Why are you disappointed, why do you complain, if they were not? No, they were not your objects—they *never* were—I cannot *believe* that they were."

Oh! that a similar spirit animated all those who think that, because they agree with his doctrinal views, they are like unto Watts Wilkinson. But he, being dead, yet speaketh; and we sincerely rejoice at so well-judged a memorial of his affectionate ministry being offered to those who loved and revered him in the flesh.

1. *Family Secrets for those who wish to make Home happy*. By Mrs. Ellis. Vol. 1. London: Fisher. 1841.

2. *The Juvenile Scrap-book*. By Mrs. Ellis. London: Fisher. 1841.

THE former of these works we shall speak of more at length when it is completed; what we have before us is good of its kind, but a little overdone—the first story is very improbable. The *Juvenile Scrap* is a very elegant present, and the plates are well selected; the literary part, too, does Mrs. Ellis no small credit, as its editor. It is certainly *the* book of the season for children.

Robert and Frederic: a Boy's Book. London: Seeleys. 1841.

WE are pleased with this volume, and can recommend it as a very useful and acceptable present for boys at the present season.

The Mortality, Sufferings, and Diseases of Grinders. Part 1. *Fork Grinders.* By G. Calvert Holland, M.D., Physician to the Sheffield Dispensary. London: Ollivier. 1841.

WE are very glad to meet Dr. Holland again. Truly indefatigable and untiring in the cause of benevolence and Christian charity, whatever may be the subject upon which he writes, he is sure to treat it in a novel and original manner, and in a style at once spirited, forcible, and pointed. Possessing opportunities of observation which can fall to the lot of few persons, he does not permit them to run to waste, but brings the fruits of his experience before the public in a form which is sure to command attention. On the present occasion he has drawn a sad picture of human misery, and has described the sufferings of a large class of human beings, which, we much fear, are very little known to their countrymen. Dr. Holland observes, in his Preface—

“We have long been engaged in the investigation of the causes affecting the condition of the artisans in the important manufactures of this town (Sheffield), and one of the numerous results of our labours is the following record. It is presented to the public at this moment, detached from the results of other and kindred investigations, in the hope to arouse the attention of the public to the evils described, and further, to awaken their benevolence in favour of a class of individuals who have a just claim on all who sympathize with distress and wretchedness, in their aggravated forms. And we trust the appeal will not be in vain. It is no unlicensed liberty of speech to assert, that an equal amount of misery and disease, inherent in the occupation, does not exist in any pursuit of life within the vast boundaries of this empire.”

The details which Dr. Holland lays before his readers possess a most lamentable interest, and furnish a case of distress which can have but few parallels. It appears that there is no occupation in the kingdom so destructive to life as that of fork-grinding; it not only materially shortens, but also embitters existence with a distressing and incurable disease. It seems there are two kinds of forks in use, one of which is of cast metal, and receives its permanent form in the mould; the other, which is the best kind, is forged, and requires to undergo the process of grinding, which is always performed on a dry stone.

“Fork-grinding (says Dr. Holland) is always performed on a dry stone, and in this consists the peculiarly destructive character of the branch. In the room in which it is carried on there are generally from eight to ten individuals at work, and the dust which is created, composed of the fine particles of the stone and the metal, rises in clouds, and pervades the atmosphere which is breathed by the artisan.” This dust gradually undermines the vigour of the constitution, and produces permanent disease

of the lungs, difficulty of breathing, cough, and a wasting of the animal frame, often at the early age of twenty-four. The author gives some very curious tables of the mortality among the persons in this occupation, but which are too long for insertion. We will content ourselves with stating a result at which he arrives, namely, that, in a thousand persons above twenty years old, the proportion of deaths between twenty and twenty-nine years, in England and Wales, is annually 160 : in Sheffield, 184 ; but among the fork-grinders the proportion amounts to the appalling number of 475 ! It appears also that, destructive as is the character of this occupation, the persons employed in it frequently receive a very low rate of wages, and are consequently unable to withdraw for a time from work, when first attacked by the peculiar malady to which they are liable, called "the grinder's asthma," and which, if treated in its early stages, admits of considerable mitigation, if not of cure.

The pamphlet—the first of a series, to the remainder of which we shall look with considerable interest—is dedicated, with singular appropriateness, to a most distinguished fellow-labourer in the cause of humanity—Lord Ashley.

-
1. *Canadian Scenery*. London : Virtue. 1841.
 2. *The Scenery and Antiquities of Ireland*. Parts 8, 9, 10. London : Virtue. 1841.
 3. *Fox's Book of Martyrs*. Parts 8, 9, 10. London : Virtue. 1841.
 4. *Winkle's Cathedrals*. Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4. Vol. 3. London : Tilt and Bogue. 1841.

It is with great satisfaction that we find the elegant illustrations of Canadian and Irish scenery making such good progress : the latter work we are inclined to think the better of the two, though both deserve great praise, as well for the engravings as the descriptions. The work of the martyrologist, too, goes on, it would seem, prosperously : the engravings are certainly good, and that class of persons who "take in" this work will hardly be likely to trouble themselves about Mr. Maitland and his terrible "Six more Letters." With regard to the last on our list, viz., the resumed publication of "Winkle's Cathedrals," we can only say that we are truly glad to see it, and wish it a prosperous continuance. It is, in many respects, the most interesting illustrated work which is attainable at a moderate price ; while the beauty of the engravings is really wonderful. Our magnificent cathedrals are thus brought home to those whose avocations prevent their visiting, in person, the hallowed spots, and some proofs are made known to us of the taste and the munificence, as well as the piety, of our ancestors.

The National Church of England, Ancient, Apostolical, Pure: a Sermon preached on Sunday, November, 28th, 1841, for the Winchester Diocesan Church Building Society. By the Rev. Robert Eden, M.A., Minister of St. Mary's Chapel, Lambeth, and late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. London: Wertheim. 1841.

OF all the sermons which we have seen lately published, this is by far the most important; it embodies, with consummate skill, learning, ability, and judgment, the true principles of a Catholic Reformed Church; and when, in our next number, we come to speak on the present state of parties, we shall have recourse copiously to the pages of Mr. Eden. The notes are especially valuable: take as a sample that on the apostolical succession:—

“Nothing can be more undoubtedly true than that the clergy of the English Church have the ‘apostolical succession,’ if by that assertion it be meant that they have been appointed by the recognized officers of a Christian society, whose government is constructed upon the *model of the apostles*. But if it be meant that there is some *secret efficacious power*, that has been handed down from the apostles’ times, through a certain series of ministers, in an uninterrupted line, so that, wherever there is room to doubt of the continuity of the line (assuming that the line was not broken by contempt, but by unavoidable circumstances), all the acts of such a ministry shall have been brought into peril of being pronounced invalid—such a view of ‘apostolical succession’ must be regarded as utterly superstitious.”

Again, how admirable is the following passage, on the place assigned by our Church respectively to Scripture and Tradition:—

“If any do enquire how the Church is to extract, from a body of truth lying scattered over so wide a surface, her own confession of faith, we reply that she can only do it by the study of that Scripture itself—a guide to the ascertainment of whose meaning will be the writings of the pious and learned of all by-gone days. She will take them, however, as guides to her judgment, not as superseding it. She will, after giving them the most deferential hearing, arraign their decisions at the bar of God’s truth, and repudiate whatever seems at variance with its plain assertions; thus making the word of God the ultimate referee—the supreme authority. Such, we apprehend, was the procedure of those men who drew up our doctrinal confessions. They made the Scripture the one sufficient and authoritative standard. Tradition is not an assessor with Scripture upon the throne of judgment, but sits in a lower place; and her voice is to be listened to while she keeps her distance respectfully, speaks in a humble tone, and suggests modestly what may be, but does not pronounce what is, the import of any sentence that is heard from the throne itself. ‘What is not contained in the Scriptures, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any that it should be believed as an article of faith.’ But faith is an intelligent and a personal act: the ‘proof,’ therefore, spoken of must be to the man who exercises the faith. It were an insulting mockery to talk to a rational being of the merits of a proof, of which he is to be no judge, but some other tribunal, be it individual or corporate, besides his own.”

Nor can we conclude this brief and very imperfect notice

without referring to the grounds of the author's appeal to his congregation :—

“ Meanwhile, we must proclaim aloud the solemn duty which presses first upon *statesmen* to make such a national offering unto God as shall not supersede the exertions of the single members of the State, but form a grand foundation on which they may proceed. And this will be done if our legislators recognize the truth, that the duty of a Government originates in that of the individuals of which it is composed ; so that, when we have ascertained the sentiments which ought to regulate a Christian man in his private capacity, we possess the standard to which the acts of an Administration should be unvaryingly conformed—when they shall be brought to fear, that the only cognizance which God's tribunal shall take of the reasoning whereby they separate their official from their private responsibility, may be to expose its sophistry before men and angels. As loudly, too, must we admonish the holders of *landed property*, that the reasons which prevailed with their ancestors to build upon their estates goodly churches, and to endow them withal, rest with undiminished—and in some instances, where the inhabitants are greatly multiplied, with augmented—force upon their successors. And in the ears of yet another mighty class of our people must we sound the note of solemn duty : I speak of the *great manufacturers* and wealthy *tradesmen* of the country. To them, the man and woman whom they employ, with the children—their rising offspring—are stretching out the hands of entreaty (shall we not add, and of righteous demand), that the souls of those immortal beings, whose life is one continued act of ministering to their wealth, should be nourished unto salvation out of the abundance of that gold of which they are, in a substantial sense, the authors.”

An Essay on the Influence of Welch Tradition upon the Literature of Germany, France, and Scandinavia, which obtained the Prize of the Abergavenny Cymreiggiddion Society, at the Eisteddod of 1840. Translated from the German of Albert Schultz. Llandovery : Rees. 1841.

THAT on a subject closely connected with philology the best treatise should be written by a German, is not of itself a matter to cause surprise ; but that a Welch Society should award their prize to a foreigner, and recommend a translation into English, is certainly a proof of candour and impartiality which we were hardly prepared to expect. This, however, has been the case in the present instance, and the result is alike creditable to the author, the translator, and the Society.

The Queen and the Quakers : or, a Voice from Exeter. By Samuel Carey Richards. To which are added Letters in Defence of Church-rates. London : Painter. 1841.

MR. RICHARDS, whose labours on behalf of the poor and the Church of our land we shall soon take occasion to notice at large, has, in the excellent but unpretending volume before us, completely disposed of the subjects on which he treats.

The Letters of Peter Platitude on Cambridge and the Cantabs.
Part 1. London: Longmans. 1841.

THIS publication apparently emanates from some unhappy undergraduate, who has decided on being a "non-reading man," and has, therefore, nothing to do. It is plain that the youth feels great distinction in being a "member of Trinity"—if *indeed he be so*—and wishes at the same time to exhibit himself as one who "condescends to his position." We copy from pages 4 and 5 of this precious production a libel on the hall of what Mr. Peter Platitude claims (truly or not is another question) to be his own college:—

"Much as I had heard of the *bearishness* of Cambridge men, I fairly confess, Ben, that I was not prepared for the scenes I witnessed to-day in the hall of Trinity, contrasting so strongly with what I remember of the quiet and gentlemanly behaviour of the men in the halls at Oxford. Here each individual cuts away, without grace or ceremony, at the first joint he can lay hold of, not caring a curse for the broad-cloth of his neighbour, but splashing the gravy unmercifully on all sides. Then the waiters, who certainly appeared used to the thing, were sworn at without scruple, and kept in a constant trot up and down the tables, to supply the students with 'sizings,' as they call the pastry, from the kitchen, consisting of wedges of pie or pudding, cut out with mathematical exactness, unvarying in size and shape, and charged as extras in our accounts. All this is very nauseous and disagreeable at first, but I suppose I shall get used to it in time. Bulwer, you know, says that Cambridge men drink beer by the gallon, and eat cheese by the hundred-weight. I thought, as I left the hall to-day, that they might drink it by the hogs-head, and eat it by the ton, if they would but do the same quietly."

This youth, who has certainly chosen a most appropriate name, stands a chance (unless our information be very incorrect) of being plucked before this month shall be expired.

Hints from a Schoolmistress, to Mothers, Daughters, and Governesses, on the Practical Application of the Principles of Education. London: Painter. 1841.

IT is one of the signs of the times that there are so many works put forth on the subject of education. This is really what it professes to be—practical; and we think that a mother, educating her own daughters, can hardly employ an hour more profitably than by perusing the "Hints" here modestly offered.

An Introduction to the Dialogues of Plato. By William Sewell, B.D., late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford. London: Rivingtons. 1841.

THE contents of this volume have appeared before in the shape of articles in the "British Critic" and "Quarterly Review." They are well adapted to guide the student in his researches, if he wishes thoroughly to understand the meaning of that greatest of uninspired men—Plato.

Garrison Sermons; being Twenty Discourses preached to her Majesty's Troops in the Island of Malta. By the Rev. T. T. H. Le Mesurier, M.A., Chaplain to the Forces, and Chaplain to the Right Honourable the Dowager Lady De Saumarez. London: Hatchards.

THE establishment of a Protestant bishop within the walls of Jerusalem gives an unprecedented interest to everything connected with religion in the eastern quarter of the globe; and we sincerely trust that such an event, which but a few years since would have been considered nothing better than a visionary scheme, will have great weight in making known to the inhabitants of those regions the pure doctrines of our Church, in all their beauty and holiness. Impressed with these sentiments, it is with no ordinary concern that we look to everything connected with religion which proceeds from this portion of the world; and in this respect Malta particularly strikes our attention. This island, from its position, must ever be regarded as the out-work of Christianity in the East—as the point whence everything, in the way of intelligence of the doings of the Protestant Church in Europe, will reach the ears of the numerous clergymen whom we hope long to see established along the shores of the Mediterranean. The sermons now before us, which were preached in this singular island, are not merely deserving the notice of those whose occupation is in “the tented field,” but they will be read with a deep interest by every class and grade of society. They are plain, practical, and, what is more, there is nothing extraneous in them; they are grounded solely on the language and warnings of the Old Testament, and on the doctrines of the New one. In the course of our reading we have met with other discourses more ornamental in their style, more diffuse and elaborate in their composition; but we may confidently assert, we have never read any more sound, more concise, and which pointed out and enforced the duty of a Christian more powerfully, than these which we have now endeavoured to bring more prominently to the notice of our readers.

The History of Poland and Russia. By Miss Julia Corner. London: Dean and Munday. 1841.

WE have seen several other numbers, or rather volumes, of this series, viz., the Juvenile Historical Library, and are sorry that we cannot speak with much commendation either of its spirit or its execution. The fair historian is evidently a Liberal, and her political views colour and spoil her historical ones. The book before us is also exceedingly defective in mere historical particulars.

The Christian Diary : with Moral and Religious Reflections, deduced from a Text of Scripture, for every Day in the Year. London : Hastings.

THIS little book is a very good manual, but we do sincerely regret the occurrence of such a passage in the Preface as the following :—

“ In venturing to dedicate the following pages to the Christian public, of all denominations and of every sect, the author does so from a consciousness that every endeavour has been used to avoid introducing any topic which might militate against the feelings of any portion of the Christian community. While the faith as it is in Christ is inculcated, sectarian differences and controversial theology, it is hoped—it is intended—are carefully eschewed.”

We do not object to a book because it does not touch on such topics ; but we do deprecate the ostentatious putting forth of such a fact as a merit.

1. *Notes on the Contributions of the Rev. George Townsend, M.A., Prebendary of Durham, &c., to the New Edition of Foxe's Martyrology.* By the Rev. S. R. Maitland, Librarian to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. Part 1. On the Memoir of Fox, ascribed to his Son. London : Rivingtons. 1841.

2. *Six more Letters on Foxe's Acts and Monuments : originally published in the "British Magazine," in the Years 1837 and 1838.* By the Rev. S. R. Maitland, &c. London : Rivingtons. 1841.

If ever there was one person more qualified than another to do the “dissection” in a review, that person is the Rev. Samuel Rogers Maitland. With the most deliciously quiet humour he combines the most exterminating powers of sarcasm ; and we would not for a trifle be the unlucky wight whose nimious pretensions he should undertake to expose. We sincerely lament that we do not agree with his theology ; for, as a critic, we entertain for him the greatest possible respect. To any scholar, who wishes to enjoy an hour's subdued cachinnation, we would recommend the fun which he has extracted from poor Mr. Catley's manifold blunders ; while those who feel interested in the records of the martyrologist will find the Notes on Mr. Townsend's “Contributions” well worthy their perusal.

An Exposition upon the Epistles of the Apostle St. Paul to the Thessalonians. By the Right Rev. Father in God, John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury. A new edition, carefully revised and corrected. By the Rev. Peter Hall, M.A., Rector of Millstown, Wilts, and Minister of Long-acre Chapel, London. London : Wertheim.

A GOOD book carefully edited: we need say no more, for, though we by no means allot to Jewel the high rank among our Reformers which he usually obtains, we still look upon him as a faithful and able divine.

1. *Illustrations of the Tragedies of Æschylus and Sophocles, from the Greek, Latin, and English Poets: with an Introductory Essay.* No. 1. By J. F. Boyes, M.A., St. John's College, Oxford. *Agamemnon.* Oxford: Vincent. 1841.

2. *Illustrations of the Tragedies of Æschylus and Sophocles.* No. 2. By J. F. Boyes, M.A., St. John's College, Oxford. Oxford: Vincent.

THIS is a new species of enterprise, and one to which we cordially wish success; it is a bringing together of ancient and modern literature: and Mr. Boyes has given proof, in this attempt to illustrate the "Agamemnon" of Æschylus, of a well furnished mind and a correct taste.

The Suppliants—*The Seven against Thebes*—and *Prometheus Chained*, are the three tragedies which are illustrated in the second part; and we feel much pleasure in saying that the commentator has exhibited, not only much power and extensive research in modern poetry, but a very just and philosophical appreciation of poetry itself.

Confusions of an Apostate. By the Author of "Felix de Lisle." London: Seeleys. 1841.

WE have read this little book with much attention, and, with the exception of passages here and there, which are *ultra-Protestant*, we can approve it. The Romanizing tendencies of the Tracts need to be met with every description of weapon.

On the Apostasy predicted by St. Paul. By Mortimer O'Sullivan, D.D., Rector of Killyman. Part 2. Dublin: Curry. 1841.

DR. O'SULLIVAN is sometimes right, and sometimes wrong, in this investigation: all that we can say is, that when he is right, he is so by following other commentators; when he is wrong, he is so by following his own opinions.

The Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. Parts 22, 23, 24. London: Taylor and Walton. 1841.

WE shall, when this Dictionary is completed, enter at some length into the subjects on which it treats; we can here only say, that it proceeds in a highly satisfactory manner, and will be by far the best work of the kind in our own or any other language.

Ancient Christianity. No. 5. London: Jackson and Walford. 1841.

WHEN the first volume of this work was before the public we gave it our most attentive consideration: we shall do so again when it is completed. In the mean time, we see no cause to alter our already expressed opinion.

SERMONS.

1. *Sermons*. By the Rev. Henry Boys, B.A. London: Rivingtons. 1841.
2. *The Doctrines of the Church of England compared with Scripture and contrasted with Popery; in seventeen Sermons upon the principal Articles of the Reformed Anglican Church*. By the Rev. William Curling, M.A. London: Hatchards. 1841.
3. *Man's Responsibility, in reference to his Religious Belief, explained and applied*. By the Rev. Theyre T. Smith, M.A. The Hulsæan Lectures for 1839. London: Fellowes. 1841.
4. *The Christian Religion, in connexion with the Principles of Morality*. By the Rev. Theyre T. Smith, M.A. The Hulsæan Lectures for 1840. London: Fellowes. 1841.
5. *Five Sermons for the Times, against Puseyism on the one hand, and Dissent on the other*. London: Baisler. 1841.
6. *Six Plain Sermons*. By Philalethes. London: Hatchards. 1841.

It is not often, even in these days, when good sermons are so common, that we are called upon to notice so many volumes of decided ability. Mr. Boys and Mr. Curling, though there are points on which we differ from the latter, have well considered and elaborated the subjects on which they treat. The Hulsæan Lectures of Mr. Smith are above all praise; they are equally luminous, practical, and philosophical: and those of Mr. Sabin, though we exceedingly dislike the offensive term "*Puseyism*," have not in them one other word to which we can offer any objection; they are a good exposition of *Evangelical High Churchmanship*.

Report of the Syrian Medical Aid Association.

IF our limits would allow us to enter at large into the good which bids fair to be done by this truly benevolent institution, we could lay before our readers such a case as would induce them, we think, to aid the plans of the founders:—

"In that country, no hospitals, dispensaries, infirmaries, or public charities exist, to receive the diseased, the mendicant, the orphan, or the helpless widow. Sympathy can but offer prayer and hope; while sickness preys unchecked upon its victims, without science to eradicate, or benevolence to alleviate it."

The case is one which affects our own countrymen. An American missionary writes thus:—

"The only two English merchant ships now on the coast have come down from Scandaroon, with nearly all their men so sick as to require them to be landed. Several of them have already died and all suffer greatly. This is the case every year. Yours will be a most benevolent scheme, did it do no more than relieve the dreadful sufferings of this class of strangers."

THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
Quarterly Review.

APRIL, MDCCCXLII.

ART. I.—*The Church of Rome—Oxford Theology—and the Tracts for the Times. Correspondence between the Rev. Dr. Pusey and the Rev. Dr. Miley.*

THE most important publications, of late date, connected with English theology, are unquestionably those which have originated from the *Tracts for the Times*. The decided course which we have taken with regard to that extraordinary series, and the grounds upon which, especially since April 1840, we have based our opposition to them, require here no further notice.

But while we rejoice in the consciousness that, day by day, the principles upon which we have proceeded are better understood, and making greater progress, we are not surprised to find that even yet there are many to whom they are still a mystery. These persons do not perceive how we may most heartily detest Popery, and yet be willing to enter into commercial and diplomatic relations with the temporal head of the Roman state—how we may most earnestly protest against the theology of Dr. Pusey, and yet look on him, personally, as a most upright and pious man—how we may prize the Reformation and deeply value the spiritual blessings it has entailed upon us, and yet utterly detest the spirit of spoliation which distinguished alike the ministers of Henry VIII. and of Edward VI.—how we may advocate at once the revocation of the grant to Maynooth and the repeal of the statute of mortmain—how, in fine, we can be **EVANGELICAL HIGH CHURCHMEN?**

We feel that the corrupt Church of Rome is making rapid advances. We see in her no symptoms of approximation to “the truth as it is in Jesus ;” yet we will not cease to pray for a reunion with her, *NOT by our taking up her errors, BUT by her discarding them.*

It is the more necessary to continue our protest against the doctrines promulgated by the Oxford divines, because in all classes of men they have found agents to promote their views. Octavos, duodecimos, and pamphlets are thrown off in profusion by their adherents; quarterly, monthly, weekly, and daily periodicals, advocate their tenets.*

We have already viewed the school of the Tractarians with reference to the Anglican Church. In the present article we shall view it with reference to the Church of Rome; and, in our notice of Mr. Goode's able work, we shall be led to consider it with regard to the doctrines of those usually called *evangelical*.

The publication of Mr. Newman's letters to the Bishop of Oxford and Dr. Jelf gave us an opportunity for pointing out, as we did in our October number, the false position towards the Church of England taken up by the writers of the *Tracts for the Times*. We remarked on the inconsistency of their professing such extraordinary reverence for old traditional authority, while not showing proper and customary deference to recent and living authority—to that immediate portion of the Church, by means of which they themselves had received their spiritual being and standing. And we observed on the unseemliness of the "Oxford Theology," when regarded as being in opposition to the known and expressed opinions of the Church of England, and of that University whose honourable name they bear. And, with reference to the apparent leaning of the writers of the *Tracts* towards the Church of Rome, it was observed—"we perceive no symptoms of amelioration on the part of Rome to abate our fears—no returning favour towards Protestants to warrant our favourable regards towards her." (p. 410.) And, having shown their inconsistency, as members of the Church of England, we will now endeavour to point out how equally false, towards the Church of Rome, is the position in which these gentlemen have placed themselves; for doing which, a favourable opportunity has occurred in the Correspondence between the Rev. Dr. Pusey and the Rev. Dr. Miley.

There is no doubt that "the Oxford movement" has been watched with the deepest interest by the Roman clergy, and that they have thereby been led to form the most extravagant expectations. Under these expectations they have occasionally used language of kindness and conciliation with reference to that movement, in hopes of helping it forward—in hopes of drawing those engaged in it nearer and nearer towards Popery. This

* The latest adherent is, we believe, the Rev. M. A. Gathercole, now the Editor of *The Church Intelligencer* and *The Church Magazine*.

kindness of language (which should really go for nothing, since they took care never to commit themselves) has been mistaken for conception of principle ; as if, in the Church of *Rome*, any *individual* would concede a *principle*, and as if Rome were drawing nearer to Oxford, because a pseudo-Oxford was making advances towards Rome. The Correspondence of Dr. Pusey and Dr. Miley enables us to test the value of their concession.

It appears that Dr. Pusey, in consistency with the principles laid down in the "Oxford Tracts," thought it right, when in Ireland, to visit certain Roman Catholic chapels, and, in so doing, thought it right to kneel on entering them, because his attendant knelt. Dr. Pusey further thought it right to be present at the service of the mass, and to join in the prostrations of the Romanists during the elevation of the host, save and except that he *did not bow so low* as the true worshippers. And, in consequence of these acts, the priest, Dr. Miley, congratulated "the good people of St. Audeons upon the singular change which had come over the spirit of the Established Church" of these lands since the year 1841 ;—"to Dr. Pusey's honour," he spake it : "the most erudite divine of Oxford had adored" the mysteries of the eucharistic sacrifice in the Roman Catholic Church.

This public announcement of Dr. Miley drew forth an explanation from Dr. Pusey, addressed, in the first instance, to a wrong person, and so embarrassing still further "the most erudite divine of Oxford," by necessitating an apology for his mistake. This apology appeared in the *Morning Register* of September 25th, addressed to the Rev. Dr. Miley, of St. Audeons. To it Dr. Miley replied September 27th. Another letter from Dr. Pusey, dated October 6th, 1841, appeared in *Saunders's News-letter* of October 15th, intended by Dr. Pusey for a full explanation of what he had done ; to which Dr. Miley published a reply. We have thus before us the materials for estimating the practical working and probable consequences of those principles, and of that line of conduct advocated in the Oxford Tracts. And as Dr. Pusey is the individual who confessedly stand sat the head of the "celebrated Oxford movement," as Dr. Miley calls it, and the party itself passes under his name, no one can take any exception, in the present instance, so as to say that these are the acts of a raw or incautious man—of one who had but imperfectly and inaccurately apprehended the meaning of the Tracts ; they are the acts of him whom all acknowledge as of the highest authority in the case—of the leader of the party : and so, beyond all question, these acts implicate the whole body.

One fact is worth a hundred arguments. We are very glad that the matter has come to this practical issue ; there cannot be

any further room for misconception of meaning, or difference of opinion concerning the consequences. In words we may be mistaken—the inferences from these words may be erroneous, and our apprehensions for the consequences may prove groundless: but facts, concerning which there can be no mistake, are now on record; and we have not to speculate on the consequences—they are already before us. And as Dr. Pusey himself, with a commendable candour, infers, from the result, that he had been “wrong in visiting their chapels at all,” and says, “Certainly I would not do it again, nor would I have done it had I foreseen the result,” so we do hope that the occurrence will be instructive to the whole party, teaching them to take more heed to their own ways, and inducing them to look with greater reverence on their immediate forerunners in the faith. We hope that this result, unforeseen by Dr. Pusey, may practically teach all those over whom he has any influence, that our fathers had, and that we still have, good grounds for that confession of faith, and that course of practice, which is meant by Reformation, and consequent separation from the Roman communion, as long as she resists all entreaties to reform.

We have no doubt that many who took part in the Reformation were as mild in disposition, as charitable towards the Romanists, and as desirous of conciliating them, as are any of the Oxford party. And we have no doubt that many attempts were made by them, which have not become matter of record, to prevent a separation from Rome, and to heal the divisions in the Church, after the schism had begun. Enough is recorded to show that more was attempted, and enough to show that the Reformers endeavoured, in the first instance, to amend Rome—that they deprecated separation, and that Rome was truly the schismatic—that she took the lead in the schism, and that the sin thereof lies at her door, and exclusively so in the first instances. It was only after repeated failures, when they would have healed her and she refused to be healed, that they found the obstinate nature of her inveterate disease; and then abiding in separation became a duty, lest they should become infected with her leprosy. The struggle at the Reformation was not a tilt at arms, in which the combatants might make sundry passes, yet all in courtesy, and being good friends all the while; it was a struggle of life and death—their own souls, and the souls of all men, were in danger of perishing with a perishing Church. They thought not of forms, and ceremonies, and external things; all their efforts were directed towards keeping life in the Church.

And this is really now, as it was then, the first thing to be contended for; but for this—but for our apprehensions that the

life of the Church is in danger, we could be content to let men deplore schism as they please, and praise Rome as they please, and visit what chapels they please, and adopt what forms of worship they please. But God hath bound up the life and well-being of the Church in the forms and ordinances which he hath appointed; and these we must guard as we would guard the life and well-being of the Church. The form filled with the life is the perfect thing—the life sought apart from the form will be imperfectly attained—the form without the life is a mockery, a dead thing, generating only corruption. And it is because we are assured that Rome is the standing example of fatal error in this matter, and because the writers of the Oxford Tracts do not perceive the difference between the right and the wrong, and so are tampering with error, and not from any desire to triumph over Dr. Pusey, we bring the whole case before our readers.

Dr. Miley, in justification of his having stated publicly that Dr. Pusey had adored the mysteries, says—

“I knew at the time I made that statement, then, that Dr. Pusey, of his accord, without invitation from anybody, had visited a collegiate and a convent chapel, at a time when there was no worship of any kind, when there was no individual present but one; and that, in both chapels, Dr. Pusey acted like a devout Catholic, by going down upon his knees, and remaining in that posture before the blessed eucharist. I knew that he had spoken in terms of admiration to more than one of the benediction of the most holy sacrament, and had assisted at it upon his knees, with most edifying manifestations of recollection and piety; and what left no reason to doubt that the mental intention was conformable to the exterior demeanour was this, that Dr. Pusey expressed his regret that he had been on his knees when the name of St. Joseph was invoked in the litanies, lest it should seem that he communicated in *that* part of the worship.”

Dr. Pusey, in giving his account of the transaction, says—

“The case, then, was this: the priest, or sister, who showed me the chapel, uniformly knelt down on entering it. I did not like to stand on entering a place consecrated to Almighty God. When my companion knelt, so I knelt too, and prayed; but when, as it happened, my companion knelt a second time at the altar on approaching it, then there could be no question that the kneeling was an act of adoration to the host, *and then I did not kneel*. In the Roman service of the mass, almost the whole, as you are aware, is ancient and pure; indeed, it has been observed that some words, in their natural sense, go against the doctrine of transubstantiation; being present there I knelt also; and since those near me bowed their heads low on their chest when the bell was rung for the adoration, I thought I might remain as I was, since I did not do what was in them the act of adoration.....I remained, therefore, as I was, hoping that my not joining in their act of

adoration was sufficient to prevent my being misunderstood.....and so may not bowing while others did, might be rather a silent inoffensive proof of my not joining in their act. In this, however, I may have been mistaken ; and if in any case it is impossible to act reverently in God's house, and yet not seem to participate in acts which one cannot with a safe conscience join, it is certainly an indication that one should not, under such circumstances, go there at all.....I trust that no perplexity has been raised, and that the pain of making all these statements will be a sufficient amends ; and that persons will not be tempted to do without cause, or in an undisciplined way, what I thought I had sufficient cause for. But certainly the result is, that I think we must keep apart, until, in God's mercy, the time come which we pray for, that God will have pity on his Church, and heal her distractions, and restore her health, and make us again, visibly, one fold under one shepherd."

This explanation merely shows that Dr. Pusey miscalculated the effect of what he was doing, and the interpretation which would be put upon his acts, both by Protestants and Romanists. With Dr. Pusey, as an individual, and with anything between him and Dr. Miley, we desire not to interfere. But we scarcely know what ground Dr. Pusey means to take ; for, in a passage at the beginning of his letter, he says that he was acting *privately*, and complains of "being dragged before the public;" yet, at the conclusion, says that he "went, not out of curiosity, but having good ends;" and deprecates persons doing, without cause, or in an undisciplined way, what he thought he had sufficient cause for doing ; and trusts that no perplexity has been raised, and that the pain of making these statements is sufficient amends.

Dr. Pusey is certainly deceiving himself, if he supposes that such acts in him will be regarded as the acts of a private person, or that the only perplexity is that concerning his motives and feelings, the statement of which will both remove the perplexity and make a sufficient amends. These acts are the legitimate consequences of principles which have been advocated by that party, of which Dr. Pusey is the leader, for many years, though now for the first time brought fairly into operation. And it is not "*sufficient*" for Dr. Pusey to say, "certainly there seems some mistake in it, since the consequence has been what it has." "Certainly I would not do it again, nor would I have done it, had I foreseen the result." The "amends" which the Church has a right to expect, and which she will deem "*sufficient*," is the correcting of those false principles which have led to this mistake and these consequences. A cotemporary writer, who has most strenuously advocated the doctrines of the Tracts, has said, if they should prove to be mistaken, "we will shrink from

no penance which may be exacted as the price of unsettling men's minds." The penance which we should exact would be rather a severe one; it would be to revise the ninety Tracts in the light of the experience so recently acquired through Dr. Pusey.

We have been often led to think that a little more knowledge of the actual state of things would be very serviceable to the writers of the Oxford Tracts. It would seem as if they had lived very much apart from the world, secluded in their colleges, finding a world in their books, and scarcely aware how very different men are, when we come in contact with them, from what they ought to be—from what right reason, and our own feelings towards them, would lead us to infer. And another and worse consequence of seclusion we have also observed in these writers, namely, a monkish turn of mind, with its isolation, concentration within, making self the standard of judgment, and seeking to make self the model for others. The only cure for all these evils is found in coming into contact with mankind, and getting a few such rebuffs as Dr. Pusey has experienced.

And that it may not be without all the benefit which may be derived from this occurrence, we will point out such of their mistakes as have been made manifest therein, and which may be of service to them, as well as to those for whom we more especially write. On a broad and superficial view of this correspondence, it might be thought, that the Protestant Church, represented in Dr. Pusey, was merely showing itself more Catholic than the Roman Church, represented in Dr. Miley; or, by those less favourably inclined, that carelessness or over-revering simplicity was manifested in Dr. Pusey. But it will be our endeavour to show that the whole transaction is in consistency with the principles of Romanism and of the Tracts—that of these principles it is the natural, and ought to have been the foreseen, result.

Three hundred years ago all the life that remained in the Church, all the energy that survived through the notorious corruptions and oppressions with which she had been long overlaid, struggled for emancipation—struggled to attain that free exercise of its instinctive cravings—that liberty of action, within the bounds of duty, which the very word of duty implies. That as personal duties imply personal responsibilities, which cannot be transferred to another, but for which we are held accountable individually, so liberty of action, and choice in the fulfilment of those duties, is a requirement of common sense, God's common gift to all men. If, at that time, the Church of Rome, in the fearless consciousness that God was present with his Church,

had simply and at once appealed to the Scriptures—to which alone, after all, we must ultimately have recourse, to learn those duties, to determine those limits, and to know those responsibilities—the separation which took place might have been averted. But they feared to do so—they feared for the whole fabric *which they called the Church* ; and though they were continually boasting the possession of the keys, and that the gates of hell could not prevail against them, their conduct proved that it was an empty boast. If they had really felt the truth of what they spake, it would have produced opposite conduct ; they would not have shrunk from, they would have courted, investigation—they would have rejoiced in bringing everything to the test of Scripture, as the only standard of truth ; and, above all, if conscious of the *presence of God*, they would know that it is as *the Holy Spirit, the Comforter*, that he manifests his presence, whose *especial* office it is *to lead the Church into all truth*. The presence of God, to be a reality, to be more than an empty boast, must be practically relied on, and habitually trusted in, both as regard ourselves and as regards all our brethren in the Church. At the time of which we speak the Romanists and Reformers were one Church, in every sense ; but Rome regarded not the Spirit of God as so present *with them* as to enable them, in present light and consciousness, to contend for the truth ; nor so present *with the Reformers*—although baptized into the one Church—as that *they* had any truth at all in the cry they raised for the *reformation* of the Church.

And the Romanists felt then, as they do now, that all the parts of their system hang together—that you cannot loosen or remove one part of the fabric without endangering the whole. There was, too, even then, a charm in the venerable antiquity of Rome very captivating to men of taste, and so like religious feeling as to be often mistaken for it ; and this has been continually increasing, as time rolls on, till, like some ancient pile mellowed and overgrown by its antiquity and our neglect, yet so beautiful that the hand of taste would fear to touch, lest it might destroy ; and, in admiration of the gorgeous ruin, mantled with creepers and parasites, which cover its walls and feed upon its mouldering, we totally forget the higher and nobler ends for which the structure was originally reared. This is the case with the vast majority of Romanists, as a matter of course ; and it is also the case with a very large proportion amongst ourselves, with all those in whose character the love of form and of order preponderate ; with the writers of the Oxford Tracts, with scarcely an exception.

It was for *life* that the Reformers contended ; and if Rome

had been wise—if she had yielded herself to the Spirit of God, this cry of the Reformers would have been heeded, not repressed—would have been so heeded as to have retained them within the Church of Rome, which might then have become truly the Catholic Church, as retaining all the true and essential forms of Christianity, yet so as to afford full scope and liberty for spirit and life, which it would be absurd to place in forms, but which have their place in the individual members of the Church. That it is possible to combine both—to retain the forms and yet give scope for the life—is witnessed by the Church of England. In her confessions and formularies, and in the practices of her faithful members, Christian discipline and Christian liberty have been equally exemplified.

But not all the men who contended for life in the Church—not all who were truly actuated by the spirit of the Reformation, were driven out of the Church of Rome; some of the salt still remained, who have preserved her from total and utter corruption; and while any such remain we may not cease to regard Rome as a true Church, and need not entirely despair of her future reformation. Some of these were men of peace, whose gentle disposition shrank from contention, even for the truth, and whose large charity thought evil of no man, and would even hide a multitude of sins. And some loved form so much, that they felt as if they could not live without it; as if the very life itself would escape if it had not the forms to hold by.

And of those who were driven out from Rome, not all were of one spirit; they did not all perceive the equal necessity there is for retaining true forms in the Church, to express the life which is in her, as for retaining the life itself. There is perfect order in all the works of God, and he requires order in his service, and hath given examples of order in the several services which he hath at sundry times appointed. A *body* is the figure chosen to represent the Church, of which all the members are balanced, symmetrical, and orderly: and where the body is healthy, and the soul is reasonable, all the members are equally animated; yet each keeps to its own place and its own functions, and so there is no irregularity, no confusion. Convulsive starts in the members, on the one hand, and paralysis on the other, equally prove an unhealthy or dementate condition—equally disfigure and mar the image of God in man. And the Church, in like manner, is misemployed or useless, as a body, if she retain not both the forms, and the living principle rightly and vigorously to employ those several forms.

Many of those who contended for life in the Church, and

were cast out from Rome, have certainly departed as widely from the truth, in despising forms, as Rome did in idolizing them. But these are equal errors on both sides, and are not peculiar to the times of the Reformation—they are common to all times. St. Paul had occasion to reprove the Galatians of the one error, of substituting forms for realities; and he had occasion to reprove the Corinthians of the other error, of the disorderly exercise even of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. And it is a very narrow and insufficient view of the matter which would charge upon the Reformation the lawlessness of the sectarians and infidels; we might as well charge upon the Reformation the idolatry of the Papists. Corrupt human nature, which is ever prone to evil, is the source of both errors; and the assertion of one of the advocates of the Tract doctrines, that “Protestantism is the religion of the natural man,” only demonstrates, in such an assertion, that he himself is blinded on one side, by his idolatry of forms, so as not to perceive that *a religion of sense*, like the Papacy, is still more agreeable to the natural man than any lawlessness which is found in Protestants.

The fact is, that the same contending principles, which, operating on a large scale, three hundred years ago, wrought out the Reformation, are now at work within the Church of England; and the issues must be, either a relapse into Popery, or a running wild into schism, for all those who do not intelligently and steadfastly adhere to the principles so clearly laid down in the laws, and exemplified in the formularies of the Church of England. And if we will look to the solemn decisions of the Church—to those acts by which she is bound, and to which she is pledged as a body—and not to the acts of isolated individuals, or the hasty expressions of single men; and if we will be at the pains to study thus her laws and her formularies, they will be found to preserve in full integrity the two essentials of order and of life, and to guard effectually against the errors of formality and of lawlessness.

The Reformers clearly perceived that forms are worthless, and often pernicious, if they are not filled with life; and they also perceived that, among the forms which it was incumbent upon us to retain as channels of life and means of blessing, a distinction should be made between such as were ordained of God for imparting the new life to us, and sustaining it when given, and such forms as are ordained of the Church for the uniform, and reverent, and devout exercise of the life which God hath given for his service; and in which service further grace is continually attained, which does refresh, invigorate, and

enlarge us in our new standing, but does not change our standing—does not lift us into a higher standing, as the ordinances of life had done.

The Romanists at the Reformation, and down to the present time, have not perceived, or have wilfully confounded, these distinctions: partly from a desire to exalt the ordinances of *their Church* to a level with the ordinances of God; partly from having totally outraged the principle of the *one standing* of the baptized, in making mediators of the saints. The Reformers did not deny nor undervalue the grace imparted at confirmation, or ordination, or matrimony; but they maintained that this grace was given for discharging, as members of the one body, and in a Christian course, the duties which were then severally undertaken. But without the sacraments they would not be Christians at all: and the Reformers were really exalting the sacraments, by keeping them distinct from inferior things; the Romanists were really degrading them, by endeavouring to raise lower ordinances out of their place, and putting them on a par with the sacraments.

In conformity with the doctrine of the Reformers concerning sacraments, the Church of England admits of “two only, as generally necessary to salvation; that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.” And she defines a sacrament to be “an outward visible sign of an inward spiritual grace given unto us.” And she makes its origin and sanction to be, that it is “ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same (grace), and a pledge to assure us thereof.” This is the true account of a sacrament, of the truth of which we are as sure as that the words and acts of our Lord are true. We know that Christ ordained these; we know that he did not, in like manner, ordain any other than these. These are certainly and exclusively what we mean by sacraments, as most undeniably constituting the whole Church into that glorious, that exclusive standing which God hath given her. And other ordinances may not receive this high name, or if lower ordinances are called *sacraments*, these last must receive some higher name.

The propriety of the use of the term, the correctness of the definition given, and the exclusive application thereof to the two highest ordinances of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, we most sincerely believe, and desire most strenuously to maintain. But, amongst those who profess themselves members of the Church of England, there are some who, with the Romanists, hold other ordinances to be on the same level with those which we call sacraments, and who go even the length of calling all things in the Church, if not the whole visible creation, one

vast sacrament, and contend for a sacramental principle in all things ; and who esteem this to be a great advance—a high attainment in Christian experience.

These opinions (concerning a sacramental principle as pervading all things, and therefore sanctioning their use in the Church, irrespective of the special appointment of God) have been darkly hinted in many of the *Tracts for the Times* ; as if much preparation was necessary to understand them, and they were not suited to the comprehension of the uninitiated. But they have been pretty fully brought out by one of that school on the notice of Bishop Jewel and remarks on the present prospects of the Church, which appeared in July last : and as the different points are there plainly stated and brought together, it is most convenient to our readers that we should make an extract from this review the basis of a few remarks on that which is called the sacramental principle :—

“ All the parts of the holy Catholic system do hang together : if it be a delusion, then even surplices are sinful ; if, on the other hand, it be a life-giving ordinance of divine appointment—one vast sacrament, then even surplices are, in their way, essential. It is one, or it is the other ; it cannot be something between both. If surplices, and the like, be, as the moderate Reformers said, merely *αἰτιαφopa* ; if they do not indicate something real and divine ; if they be not part of a system necessary to keep up the true knowledge of God in an imperfect state ; if they be not essential, in their place, to the sacramental principle of the Church—the principle of engaging the soul, through the body, in behalf of things divine ; then, indeed, they are of the very essence of formalism, and may truly be called, in the language of Bishop Jewel, theatrical. But, in truth, the Christian religion knows of no objects confined to this world. It has no forms without substance—no externals without meaning. Gorgeous chalices presume the intrinsic preciousness of the consecrated element which they enclose ; white robes imply a holy priesthood ; altars a propitiatory sacrifice ; crosses betoken the severity of the Christian life, and the all-sufficiency of the one atonement ; lights symbolize the illustrious presence of Christ in the world ; and so in other instances.”

In all this there is so much looseness of expression—such a mixture of the real with the metaphorical—such want of precision, in calling things first a life-giving ordinance, sacramental, and essential, and then speaking of *the same things* as merely implying and betokening the character *of the wearer*, or as symbolizing the presence of Christ *in the world*—that we almost doubt of our ability, in what we say, to force conviction home upon those who thus loosely express themselves. But if the writers of such sentences will be at the pains of scrutinizing their own thoughts, and of analyzing their own expressions, we

think they will find that, in speaking of "the holy Catholic system," by the word *system* is meant a device whereby certain appropriate things are brought together, to teach lessons and attain ends, through this collocation, such as they could not teach or attain in a state of separateness: and by its being called *Catholic* is meant that all men would, could, or ought to learn these lessons and to attain these ends by such a device: and it is called *holy* to denote the effect produced thereby, and not attained in any other way. So that to express correctly what appears to be meant, the order of the words should be reversed, and it should read, "all the parts of that system which conduces to Catholic holiness do hang together." And this interpretation of the meaning is confirmed by the system, as a whole, being called "a life-giving ordinance," and "a system necessary to keep up a true knowledge of God in an imperfect state."

Further it should be observed, that we cannot understand the expressions "the holy Catholic system" in the other sense, and say that the men are holy, and are Catholic, or belong to a Catholic body, and have this system, all the parts of which do hang together; for this would be inconsistent, and obviously untrue. For what has made the men thus holy? What has brought them into that Catholic body? What has put them into the place where alone they could have such a system? SACRAMENTS have done this—THE Sacraments—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. And it is not true that the things spoken of—such as surplices, gorgeous chalices, crosses, lights, &c.—are, together with Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, parts of one system; or do hang together with these institutions of Christ; or are sacramental, as these higher ordinances; or do, together with these, make one vast sacrament. Yea, other expressions of this very writer imply the strongest contradiction to this being his meaning in the words "holy Catholic system," in which holiness in a pre-eminent degree—viz., saintship—is attributed to men who held not such a system, who repudiated many of these things, and whose writings abound with warnings against putting any secondary things on a level with the primary.

Taking, therefore, the words "holy Catholic system" in their least repulsive sense, we say that they betray great inaccuracy of thought, which in some degree accounts for the looseness of expression. It is evident that the writer does not discriminate between persons and things, ascribing to things attributes which belong only to persons; the effect of which is that he degrades persons down to the level of things; though, by shifting his ground a little, this is hidden from himself. Life is the gift of

God, an attribute which He, the Triune God, delegates to no creature, but gives by his own immediate act : and by the gift of natural life he constitutes us persons. In like manner, spiritual life—the new creation, is the immediate act of God : it is a transaction between living persons and the living God—a transaction *by means* of an ordinance indeed, because it is thus that faith is brought into operation ; but not with *the intervention* of an ordinance, or any creature thing, for God is the object of our faith in the ordinance.

And as the gift of life is bringing the creature into *living being*, a power of continuous existence is implied in the gift, so as not to need the reiteration of the same gift, but, on the contrary, to preclude its repetition : so that a new gift of life would imply the withdrawal of the former gift, in order that there may be even a place for it. Yet the continuance of the life which God has given is not in the creature itself, but a continuance of the immediate act of God by which it was first brought into being : “for in him we live, and move, and have our being ; he giveth life, and breath, and all things.” In the natural life this dependence upon God is betokened in the air we breathe—an element provided by the sole hand of God, without any act of man, and received by us continuously and unconsciously, yet absolutely necessary to the support of life. And the air we breathe, *πνευμα*, is the symbol of the Spirit, *πνευμα*, whose continual abiding with the Church is included in the gift of new life, being a part of the original promise, “I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth,” (John xiv. 16). And in the Church we are not directed to any ordinance for the continuance of the Holy Spirit ; the faith in his abiding presence is presumed : we are only warned against “grieving,” “resisting,” and “quenching” him, who is perpetually present—whose temple we are—who is the life of every ordinance.

But, although there is no ordinance for repeating or prolonging the gift of life, there is an ordinance, both in the natural and in the spiritual, for sustaining life—the food of the life given : and it should be well observed, that the act of feeding *presupposes* life ; if the man be not already alive, food would be provided in vain. And God has shown great regard for the ordinance of food for sustaining life, by using it in a miraculous way, rather than setting it aside ; as in the case of Elijah, who went for forty days in the strength of food provided by an angel, and who fed on the miraculous increase of a barrel of meal and a cruise of oil, and who had food miraculously brought to him by the ravens. And our Lord exemplifies the same, both in

resisting the temptation of Satan to induce him to turn *stones* into bread, and in taking ordinary food and showing his divine power in multiplying its quantity to feed the multitudes in the wilderness, when the same divine power might have removed the pains of hunger, or satisfied it with any other thing. And though we *receive* life but once, which is continued without repetition from the beginning to the end of our days, this life is nourished and sustained by continual use of the ensuing ordinance, without which it would languish and decay. The gift of life excludes its iteration; the ordinance for sustaining it must be continually reiterated.

So that, in strict propriety of speech, there is only one "life-giving ordinance of divine appointment; "there is no "system" consisting of many such ordinances—no system of many parts, which, taken together, make up one such ordinance. And all orthodox Councils and Churches have, from the beginning, acted upon the principle of there being but one life-giving ordinance, in their steadfast refusal to repeat baptism, or to administer it to any who could, by the utmost stretch of charity, be regarded as really baptized; they allowed it to be valid when administered with water, and in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, even when by unauthorized persons, as laymen and women; and in the case of Athanasius they feared to pronounce it invalid, although only meant in sport by the children. And, in order to cover all possible cases, most Churches prescribe a conditional form of baptism, which may be used whenever there is doubt of the truth of former baptism. Not that they meant, in these cases, to approve of the conduct of those who, without warrant, take upon themselves to administer God's ordinances; but they regarded the ordinances as so solemn in being his appointed way of meeting with man, that they could not regard it as an empty form, or as ever done in vain. And they would presume the excuse of necessity, or throw the blame upon the parties who took upon themselves the responsibility, rather than make any ordinance void.

But if this sacred rite—this only life-giving ordinance of divine appointment, be classed with surplices, and chalices, and crosses, the degradation of the higher ordinance is the inevitable result. If baptism by any system is made no higher than these things, it becomes a profanity, a solemn mockery; and the system which involves such a classification is unquestionably a gross delusion, and must be abandoned. But the other alternative does not therefore follow; it does not become matter of course that surplices are "sinful," because they are not of the same importance with Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—because

they are not “sacramental.” These secondary things, in their place and measure, are not only allowable, but important.

It is quite true that all things, without exception, were made for the glory of God; and also that we may, even now, so regard and so use them as to redound to the praise and glory of God. Natural theology professes to show the wisdom and goodness of God in all the works of creation; and if, in doing so, men would take theology solely and entirely from the Bible, where alone it can be acquired, all would be well. Scriptural theology reveals a God with attributes of *justice* and *mercy*, as well as of wisdom and goodness—reveals these attributes in the *fall* and *recovery* of the creation, combined with what we may still infer its condition to have been when *first* brought into being. The whole creation, with man at the head of it, was declared at the first to be very good. The fall of man brought evil into this goodly world, and that not only upon *himself*, but upon *the creatures* which had been given into his hand, and upon *the ground* which was cursed for his sake. This true theology should be continually brought to bear upon those investigations of nature which we call natural theology. If Paley had been alive to this he would have written a better book; and if Buckland had apprehended it at all he would not have made such a hash of the question as we see in his Bridgewater Treatise, chapter xiii.

If man had not fallen, there would have been no distinction between the Church and the world; all things would have been equally sacred; religion and nature would have coincided; the universe would have formed one temple, of which the whole race of mankind would have been the priests; and in such a state of things there would be no place for figures, symbols, or types; everything would have been *really* that which it *appeared* to be; there would have been a condition of things having, as these writers say, “no forms without substance.” But this is a condition of things which has no existence, save in the regions of imagination; yet it is really in order to wander in this region of fancy that these writers profess a religion which “knows of no objects confined to this world.” Since the fall, man, in his natural state, is incapable of doing or devising anything acceptable to God: and the whole creation being under the curse of that fall, man could find nothing in all nature proper for the service of God, even if he could devise acceptable service. Thus God must prescribe and appoint the service, and must choose the things wherewith he will be served; and our heeding the appointments of God, and serving him in this the only right way, and not in ways of our own choosing, is walking in faith—is following Abel’s faith, not the way of Cain.

although neither man, the head of the creation, nor any re thing, have the smallest pretensions to natural or inhe-oliness, yet God hath hallowed, or set apart for his service,s, places, and things, at all times; and this is all that can e meant by the "holy Catholic system." And because e act of God, and does not at all depend upon the inhe-ualities and properties of the persons and things, it is not l that the same persons and things be constantly the sub-n which this act of God may rest; he may set aside that he hath hallowed, and lay his hand of consecration and g on whosoever and whatsoever it may seem him good s.

: choice of the Jews as a people, of Jerusalem as a place, the Mosaic ritual as a service, and the subsequent rejec-all these to choose the Gentiles, and appoint the Chris-dinances in their room, is a familiar instance of this on a cale. And looking at the details of the history of the e find changes most remarkable, yet all the act of God, scribed by him. For four hundred years after God had the seed of Abram, we find no trace of what is called holy Catholic system." Abraham, the friend of God, Jacob, the heads of the tribes, and their posterity for generations, knew nothing whatever of the Mosaic rites, hence, as we shall show, this "system" is principally l. And Moses invented them not; they were revealed , in their most minute details, by God himself; and over er again he is solemnly warned, "See that thou make all according to the pattern shown to thee in the mount." fore this scrupulous exactness? Wherefore this jealousy oses should depart from the pattern?—lest man should, wilfulness, add to, or take from, the revelation of God? simply because all these things were *symbolical*; they l Christ Jesus, in his person, in his offices, in his body urch; and any change in the symbols would have made o be false representations of the coming Lord and the ; dispensation.

as not for show, not merely to dedicate the best of the which we have to God, not only on "the principle of ng the soul, through the body, in behalf of things divine," e Mosaic ritual was ordained; but for the far higher re important ends of typifying the Christian dispensation mbolizing other things pertaining to other times—of de-realities not then revealed or then apprehended, but given at the coming of the Lord. They without us were ide perfect; we have attained what they waited for;

we “are come to the spirits of just men made perfect.” (Heb. xi.-xiii.)

All are agreed that this was the case with sacrifice—that every sacrifice under the law typified the one sacrifice of Christ, the Lamb of God slain for the sin of the world. And why not the ritual and ceremonial? which were only the dressings and accompaniments of the sacrifice—the circumstantialia of which it was the reality—the substance. Christ having come—having fulfilled by his death all that sacrifice typified, in ascending to heaven, not only took up the office of High Priest, which Aaron had typified, but also transferred it to another place; the place of our High Priest is not on earth, but in the heavens. And the realities with which we have to do are with him transferred to the heavens; therefore the region of the Christian Church is not the earth, under the bondage of corruption, but the heavens, the abode of her Lord and Head. “We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are unseen; for the things that are seen are temporal, but the things that are unseen are eternal.” And while we use external things, and are in the world, we are not of the world.

The broad line of distinction which separates Christianity from every other dispensation is, that, to us, death is abolished, and life and immortality begun. Christian baptism is the ordinance appointed of God whereby we may pass that gulph which fills the natural man with such terror, and may attain the regions of peace, and confidence, and eternal life. “He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved,” are the words of truth which set the ordinance. “The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us,” are the words of St. Peter, speaking of the ark. “Know ye not (saith St. Paul) that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that, like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.” The Christian, through baptism, is warranted in regarding all that made death terrible as removed; and, by the atonement of Christ, therein applied to us, not only mercy triumphing over judgment, in remedying the mischiefs of the fall, but man, by membership with Christ Jesus, raised into fellowship with the Lord of heaven and earth—a condition far higher than that of Adam before the fall. And it was a true apprehension of this peculiar and pre-eminent dignity, which is attained under the Christian dispensation, that made the early Church regard sin after baptism as so greatly aggravated, that many foolishly procrastinated baptism, lest they should not have grace to overcome

subsequent temptation; forgetting that *faith in that ordinance apprehends a grace and a power not otherwise given*—not before experienced by themselves—not possessed by any of the unbaptized.

To the man who, by baptism thus viewed, hath acquired this new standing, all things are become new, and old things are passed away. And in this sense alone is it true, that “the Christian religion knows of no objects confined to this world.” The Christian religion has a standing *above* this world, and, in the use of worldly things, has continual respect to this higher standing; not that Christianity has need of worldly things to increase its efficiency, but that in the use of all things it does consecrate them without lowering itself—raises them to its standard, does not sink to their level.

Our conversation is in heaven, because we are spiritually risen with Christ, and thus seated in heavenly places with him, and thus “come to the Mount Zion, to the city of the living God, to the general assembly and church of the first-born,” &c. Yet this glorious doctrine is not to be abused on either hand; not, on the one hand, by maintaining, with Hymeneus and Philetus, that the resurrection is passed already; or, on the other, so to debase and abuse it as to mingle earthly and heavenly things, as the Romanists are doing. We are spiritually risen with Christ, yet we look for a literal resurrection—a resurrection in deed and in truth, when these vile bodies shall be fashioned like to his glorious body, when this corruptible shall put on incorruption. We set our affections on things above—the kingdom of heaven is within us; yet we look for a time when the kingdom of heaven shall appear—when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord, and he shall reign for ever and ever. It is by faith in things unseen as yet that we now apprehend the heavenly realities; things as they are, yea, even our bodies in their fallen condition, are incapable of manifesting the things of heaven—eye hath not seen them, ear hath not heard them. The doctrine of the resurrection, coupled as it is in Scripture with the restitution of all things, demonstrates this; for if our bodies, the highest, last, and best work of creation, are thus incapable, much less capable of such a manifestation of heavenly things are any of the inferior works of creation.

And this one consideration, of the necessity for a resurrection of the body, if well weighed, would refute the chimerical doctrine called a sacramental principle of the Church, and confounded with “the principle of engaging the soul, through the body, in behalf of things divine:” a confusion which, so far as it extends, proceeds from an error similar to that which pervades the whole

Papal system, from him who assumes to be vicar of Christ, down to relics of saints and the most trivial observances—the error of mingling earthly with heavenly things, and assuming that the kingdom of heaven is already come.

One cause of the great attractiveness of the Papacy is to be found in its having adopted something from all preceding systems, and something from all existing creeds; so that it is like a vast museum, in which every one, from whatever quarter, may find something to his taste. And this is mistaken for Catholicity! In Rome even the Pagan may find his Jupiter under the bust of St. Peter, and fauns, nymphs, and dryads in the garb of tutelary saints. And the man of taste may find the choicest works of art rendered subservient to religion, and so much so, that it has been even argued that the torch of genius can only shine with full splendour when it is kindled at the altar of religion—as if *enthusiasm* had but one source—as if *inspiration* had not two meanings! This *profane* mixture of the earthly, *in its worst sense*, with the heavenly, the exposure of which Middleton made the subject of his letters from Rome, we do not allude to in the preceding sentence, or parallel with the “sacramental principle,” as it is called—*this part* of the Papacy is infinitely worse. But that mingling which we speak of consists, first, in taking up the things belonging to preceding dispensations, and which were truly set there and essential *at that time*, but which have passed away with those dispensations; secondly, in assuming that a dispensation *which shall succeed* the present—namely, the kingdom of heaven—is already arrived, and so doing things inconsistent with our present standing: and thus, rather ignorantly than criminally, they have huddled together types and symbols which are past, and glories which are yet to come, so as to disguise and change the character of the present dispensation; and it becomes neither the fulfilment of those which have preceded it, nor the promise and earnest of that which is yet to come.

Two of the most important of St. Paul’s Epistles—that to the Galatians, and that to the Hebrews—address the prevalent and very natural error of the Jewish converts, who supposed that the Mosiac dispensation, being the preparation for the Christian, the two became incorporated, and the rites of both dispensations were incumbent upon Christians: and the argument of St. Paul is, that the Jewish rites are incompatible with the profession of Christianity. Not only does he assert that they are unnecessary, or that they turn aside the attention from things which are more important, but that it would be apostasy—falling from Christ. And, in the course of this argument, it is not of

a few parts of the Jewish ritual, or of certain portions, in an especial degree, that St. Paul thus speaks ; but of the whole, as one whole, and of every portion thereof, from circumcision to the high priesthood, he says they are the rudiments of this world, to which we are become dead in Christ—the Hagar dispensation cast out, and giving place to that dispensation typified by Sarah. The real point and full force of the apostle’s argument is seldom apprehended : it is not that the Jewish symbols and service typified Christ and the service of the Christian Church ; this they did, but this is not the argument. The argument is, that the whole Jewish economy, *though upon earth*, prefigured an economy *not confined to the earth* ; and that although the correspondency between the different parts of the Jewish economy prefigured a relationship which should subsist between the analogous ordinances in the Christian Church, yet the sphere and the locality being *enlarged to heaven*, by the ascension thither of the Head of the Church, this enlargement and transference rendered our service *toto cœlo* different from that of the Jewish economy. “ We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle.” “ The priesthood being changed, there is made, of necessity, a change also of the law.”

All the services of the Mosaic ritual were transacted upon earth and within the tabernacle ; and to that tabernacle upon earth the Almighty God condescended to come down, to be present with the worshippers. We have a “ sanctuary—the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.” (Heb. viii.) And of our sanctuary, the highest part of the service is transacted not upon earth, but in heaven ; and that not merely some special services, of a higher character than the rest, but the highest part of every service—that which gives to it all its value and efficacy, as a service of God, is done in heaven. The sacrifices under the law had no efficacy in themselves, but they denoted the impossibility of fallen man’s approach to God, save by another’s undergoing that death which man had incurred. The priesthood had no power or holiness in themselves, but they showed the necessity of a Mediator between God and man. Sacrifices derive their only true meaning from Christ Jesus ; they all prefigured his one act, and had their entire fulfilment in him. So that sacrifice and priesthood centring in him, there is but one true altar—one true priest in the Christian Church, which are gone into the heavens for us, and whither we follow in faith, that *there* we may hold communion with God, through our High Priest.

The sacrifices which we are called to present are *our bodies*, “ a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, our reasonable

service." (Rom. xii.) We are called to offer "the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips." (Heb. xiii. 15.) And the angel who is with God, and hath much incense, offers it, "with the prayers of all saints, upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel's hand." (Rev. viii. 3). Altars upon earth in the Christian dispensation, and incense, &c., in their Levitical signification, are both usurpation of the prerogatives of Christ, and debarring ourselves of the legitimate access which, through him, we have to the throne of God. Such things, therefore, have both sin and folly in them, however ignorantly they may have been committed.

The Jewish service was one great symbol, appointed of God to foreshow the relative standing and connection of Christ and his Church; therefore *their completeness*—that standing which they have in the mind of God, and to which they shall be brought in the fulness of time, when the members shall be all gathered into the body, and attain unto the perfect man—the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. If the Romanists had truly held the doctrine of Scripture, "that it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but that we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him," they would not, on the one hand, people heaven with men and women like themselves, under the appellation of saints; nor, on the other, give to things on earth the attributes of heaven, and anticipate, or antedate, the kingdom of heaven. In their endeavours to make the visible Church a complete whole, and thus to be in manifest accordance with the Jewish symbol, the Romanists have succeeded, but at the expense of truth. They have done it at the peril of having other sacrifices, other mediators, and other objects of worship, than the One, all in all, Christ Jesus. We say, at the peril, and we further say, that, to our comprehension, it appears to be a system of idolatry, as the Reformers thought it. But we can stretch our charity so far as to believe that the Romanists may not so regard these things—that they may honestly disclaim the imputation of idolatry—that they may see some force in the distinctions between *dulia* and *latria*, and so forth, although we cannot.

And the Roman system has the merit of consistency! It doth hang together; it is too old not to have grown into such a conglomeration as to have a dependence of parts which resembles the solidity of a whole, and no one part can be separated without shaking all the rest. This is very strikingly exemplified in

Dr. Miley, who appears greatly shocked by Dr. Pusey's supposition that "the glories of Mary" were offences in God's sight—were things of the earth, and ought to be put away. Dr. Miley says, "Nor does it seem to me in exact conformity with piety so sensitive (as that of Dr. Pusey) to have introduced, in his last letter, 'the glories of Mary,' side by side with the things of earth, with the almost certain prospect of giving rise to irreverence, especially when he reflected upon the deplorable propensity, amongst many who protest against our holy faith, to be profane upon that most sacred subject."

Dr. Miley admits no distinctions in the different acts of worship; they are all heavenly: to protest against any of these acts is against the holy faith, and being profane, and "the glories of Mary" is "that *most* sacred subject," none higher, if there are any as high!

And let it not be thought that Dr. Pusey spoke with levity or contempt of the things which he then disapproved; he spoke to deplore them, and in the hope that they might be put away:—

"I neither cast nor implied any blame as to anything in your conventual institutions,.....nor did I mean to speak in any presumptuous tone of what was amiss in you;but when occasions offered I did speak plainly as to what I thought amiss in your communion, and which I hoped you might correct.....Your clergy, with whom I conversed, seemed not in the least conscious that there was anything, even in the practice of your Church, to amend; and thus the very first principles of a sound union (humiliation and repentance before God) seemed, on your side, to be wanting. This I felt with deep pain; and it was to this I alluded in the expressions which offended you."

It is evident that Dr. Pusey has not understood what Romanism is; on *principle* it never can change, and the only improvement that ever has taken place in the Roman system has crept in unobserved, by the shame or better feeling wrought amongst its members, from intercourse with those of other communions, and *in spite of* the opposing principles of Romanism. Every Roman Catholic professes, and the great majority of them implicitly believe, that the traditions and commands of their Church are to be received, without the slightest question, as coming from God. This fundamental principle of Romanism is become the habitual frame of mind in every one who is called "a good Catholic;" no wonder, therefore, that they "seemed not in the least conscious that there was anything" in Romanism "to amend." And as the priests are solemnly sworn to this fundamental principle, on receiving orders, the supposition by Dr. Pusey, that they were not holding this principle, might seem very like an insinuation

that they were perjured men, save that they would set it down to that ignorance and mistake which they ascribe to all Protestants.

Were not this fundamental principle of immutability so strong as to appear insuperable in the Roman Church, it would long ago have yielded, in some of the absurd and monstrous dilemmas into which it has brought the Papacy. We are not merely referring to the many schisms in the *one true Church*, while two or three of the *sole vicars* of Christ were setting up their opposite claims at the same time, and fulminating all the terrors of the Church in reciprocal hostility; but to the still more perplexing difficulty, in honestly and fairly endeavouring to reconcile the jarring decisions, not of hostile, but of distant councils.

Of the schisms in the Church of Rome, which calls itself the one only true Church, Bellarmine, its ablest advocate, allows there were twenty-six. But the good Catholics slide over these very comfortably, without enquiry, under the conviction that the truth has prevailed, and is, undoubtedly, with the Church of Rome *now*, and that we need not meddle with the quarrels of former generations so long as we ourselves are *good Catholics*. But their own definition of a good Catholic is, that he believes all the traditions of the Church; the vow is—"Apostolicas et Ecclesiasticas traditiones, reliquasque ejusdem Ecclesiæ observationes et constitutiones firmissime admitto, et amplector:" and these traditions of the Church can only be known from the decisions of the Church. Now, to take the most important class of decisions—that which decides the authority of general councils, and which councils determine the true doctrine of the Church—what says the Church of Rome concerning these councils? Rome says, that eighteen of the general councils, including that of Trent, 1545, are to be wholly received; that seven of such councils are to be wholly rejected; that six are to be partly approved and partly to be rejected; and that one is neither approved nor rejected. This last anomalous council is the Council of Pisa, of which Longus, in his "*Summa Conciliorum*," says:—

"Concilium Pisanum anno 1409 celebratum, non est manifeste nec probatum, nec reprobatum: nam ex una parte, depositis Gregorio XII. et Benedicto XIII., elegit Alexandrus V., qui inter veros Pontifices numeratur: ex altera vero, S. Antonius, 3 par. tit. 22, cap. v., § 2, asserit, ipsum esse conciliabulum; et eventus idem ostendisse videtur: quia coactum fuit concilium ad schisma tollendum, et tamen illud non sustulit, sed auxit. Si vero absolute fuisset reprobatum; utique Alexander VI. se non sextum sed quintum appellasset."

The Roman Church claims infallibility—that in all her decisions she has been guided by the Holy Spirit; yet here is a case in which two Popes were deposed, a third appointed—the whole proceeding acquiesced in at the time, and sanctioned by implication of succeeding Popes; and, notwithstanding all this, the validity of the acts of this council are questioned, because *the event* did not answer the expectations! And cases very similar to this may be adduced in great numbers.

When judgment has been so prostrated at the shrine of superstition, as it must be in such cases as these, it is puerile in Dr. Pusey to suppose that he could reinvigorate it by the feeble incentives he had to present; nor will the men, who have not been repelled by enormous objections like these, now, at last, stumble at mole-hills. The very basis of the Papal system is the suppression of private judgment; and it is idle in any one to appeal to the judgment of a man who is in the trammels of the Papacy. On this very point the Oxford party are grossly inconsistent; they declaim against the Reformation for having given license to private judgment, which license alone has enabled them so to declaim. Their gentle rebukes of the Papacy, which do but “just hint a fault and hesitate dislike,” would not have been endured *but for the Reformation*, nor but for that soul-stirring burst of light would they have had thus much of discernment. And had they, under the old condition of things, spoken of the Papacy as they have now done of their own Church, the dungeons of the inquisition would have been their lot. Even now it is well known to us, that the Romanists cannot trust their new converts to hold any intercourse with their former friends without the presence of some trusty priest, who may turn aside, or even forbid, any anti-papal discussion. And we have not the least doubt that the writings of Dr. Wiseman, much the ablest of their present champions, will ultimately loosen the hold which Rome has over some of her clergy, merely by inducing them to reason and reflect.

The tendency of spirit in Dr. Pusey and his followers is that of being very much impressed by external forms; and so they are in danger of attaching undue importance to mere forms, and also of estimating their relative importance, according as they are more or less imposing. This is the kind of spirit which is especially generated and fostered in the Roman Church, and is the point of attraction between these two parties. We are far from saying that this tendency of spirit is an evil thing, provided it be so directed as to find its gratification in forms which are lawful—that is, forms which are ordained of God, when he

will be abundantly present ; or forms which are not contrary to his appointments, which may then be a help to true devotion. But this spirit becomes an evil, if, in seeking its gratification, it multiplies unnecessary forms ; and a very aggravated evil, and a most presumptuous sin, if it invests its own optional forms with the sanctity due to the ordinances which are of God's appointment : and this is the sin committed by the Church of Rome. To instance this in dresses, let any one turn to Gavanti's "Thesaurus," or similar authorities, and he will find that Rome enjoins particular dresses for particular seasons, and assigns the meaning they have in being so worn ; and every "good Catholic" believes and maintains that these are among the traditions of the Church, which are to be fully and universally held, as having the same divine sanction as all the other ordinances of the Church. Yet the very first remark of Gavanti on the various coloured dresses used in the Roman services is, that they were not from the beginning, but brought in by degrees. "Vestes sacerdotales per incrementa ad eum, qui nunc habetur, ornatum auctæ sunt : nam primis temporibus communi indumento vestiti Missas agebant." (Pars. i. tit. 18.) And in a subsequent note he says that four of the five colours were adopted in imitation of the dress of the high priest under the law, only that green stands for blue ; and that black, the fifth, was chosen as most appropriate in masses for the dead, but that black is an innovation, purple having been previously used. "*Quinque coloribus.* Totidem enumerat colores Innocentius III. quamois nigrum confundere videatur cum violaces, quatuor principales faciens colores, quatuor coloribus antiquarum vestium legalium respondententes." (Exod. xxviii.) We should not transcribe such nonsense as this, which asserts that four colours are five, and that blue is green, but that we need a sample of the stuff that is palmed off upon the votaries of Rome in the way of Church tradition, in order that we may point out the evil which may lurk under that "sacramental principle" which Dr. Pusey and his friends so highly extol. And we would also apply it in proof of the degree of dementation to which men may be brought, who prostrate their individual judgment, and are guided entirely by the dictation of other men.

It is probable that Dr. Pusey would not allow that the "sacramental principle" embraces all those things enjoined in the Roman ritual, and it is certain that the Romanists would not allow a term so high as "sacramental" to be applied to any such things ; yet both Dr. Pusey and the Romanists mean the same thing, in the sanctity they ascribe to dresses, altars,

chalices, &c. : and they speak as if there were no other alternative between the use of them being thus "sacramental," or its being "sinful." And although Dr. Pusey may be only *at present* contending for such forms as are enjoined in the Church of England, yet if he is contending for them on the grounds which the Romanists take in defending their forms, the Roman principles must bring in all the Roman forms at some *future time*—and would do so *even now*, if these gentlemen were consistent, and followed out their principles to the legitimate consequences.

For, in the instance of coloured vestments, referred to above, the Romanists have only ancient usage to plead—no directions in Scripture, no injunctions of the Church for their introduction; nor are they all of equal antiquity, but have come in at different times—some brought in by emperors and laymen, and all, at the beginning, at the option of the parties to use them or not. But since the time when the traditions of the Church were made of paramount authority, and usages were ranked with traditions, all these vestments, without distinction, have been held essential to the several services, and quite indispensable, and the man who wilfully omits any of them commits a mortal sin. "*Qui aliquam prædictarum vestium sponte omiserit, pescat mortaliter, excommuni Doctorum sententia.*" (Gavanti pars. ii. tit. 1, § 5). And in the Appendix to Palmer's "*Antiquities of the English Ritual*," which treats of the dresses prescribed in the rubric of the Church of England, the ecclesiastical vestures there mentioned are, in like manner, traced to ancient usage alone:—

"The vestment.....has been used by the ministers of the Christian Church from a period of remote antiquity." (p. 309).

"The cope is a garment of considerable antiquity ;.....the original identity of the cope and casula (or vestment) appears from the writings of Isidore Hispalensis." (p. 312).

"The tunicle was used in the earliest ages of the Christian Church ;originally it had no sleeves, and was then often called collobium.It is said that wide sleeves were added to the collobium about the fourth century, in the west, which thenceforth was often called dalmatic, and when used by subdeacons, tunicle." (p. 315).

And so of the other dresses. In which last quotation, be it observed, that "*the earliest ages of the Christian Church*" is "*about the fourth century ;*" and the remote antiquity in the other passages does not reach within three hundred years of the apostles' time. And, in speaking of the surplice, it is afterwards said (p. 320), that its peculiarity, as distinct, from the albe, and its very name, did not begin before the twelfth century. "In

after ages it was thought advisable to make a distinction..... and *then* a difference was made in the sleeves : and from about the twelfth century the name of surplice was introduced." Yet the surplice is one of the things declared to be "sacramental ;" so that for twelve centuries the Church was destitute of this "sacramental" blessing, and did not know her destitution ; and it came in at last, not in consequence of God having beheld her destitution, and himself, in pity, supplying it, but because it was *thought advisable* to make a distinction !!! What a "sacramental principle !"

But although surplices, and the other things classed with them, have not the place which Dr. Pusey and his friends imagine, and although the "sacramental principle," as they hold it, is "a delusion," it does not follow that such things are therefore "theatrical," and still less that they are "sinful." In the imaginary system of these gentlemen they are "theatrical," for they are a specious semblance of unrealities, and would be very speedily "sinful," as they would certainly bring in all the abuses and corruptions of Rome. But they have a place, and an important one, in the service of the Church ; that is, the place which has been assigned to them by the Church of England. Decency and comeliness were in the mind of the Church of England in enjoining such things, as appears from the fifty-eighth canon, and as it is more fully expressed in the seventy-fourth, which is entitled, "Decency in apparel enjoined to ministers," and which thus begins : "The true, ancient, and flourishing Churches of Christ, being ever desirous that their prelacy and clergy might be had as well in outward reverence, as otherwise regarded for the worthiness of their ministry, did think it fit, by a prescript form of decent and comely apparel, to have them known to the people, and thereby to receive the honour and estimation due to the special messengers and ministers of Almighty God : we therefore, following their grave judgment and the ancient custom of the Church of England, and hoping that, in time, new-fangleness of apparel, in some factious persons, will die of itself, do constitute and appoint that the archbishops and bishops shall not intermit to use the accustomed apparel of their degrees." And so of deans, masters, prebendaries, priests, deacons, and scholars. The fifty-eighth canon puts surplices upon the same ground of decency and comeliness as the other dresses which are spoken of in the seventy-fourth ; and it is the only true ground for this or any other forms in the Christian Church. If forms and ceremonies are not kept subservient to the ever-present realities in Chris-

tian worship, men will be turned aside from the real object of worship to the forms—to the ceremonies—to the men; they will be virtually worshipping *things*, and this is idolatry.

For, it cannot be too often repeated, our forms are not symbols or types, as were all the Jewish forms. They, by the symbol, had their faith directed to a future dispensation, which is now come; and we, by means of forms, enter into present realities: this made the point of St. Paul's declaration, that those forms were decaying, and waxing old, and ready to vanish away. And although we grant that the surplice derives additional decency and comeliness from its resemblance to the dress of the *ordinary* priests (not the high priest) under the law, this resemblance of priest to priest should be coupled with the recollection that *Christian priests* have a far higher standing, and a far more immediate access to God, than any priests of old—more near than that of the high priest himself under the law: he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than any predecessor of Christ. We have a *standing* of acceptance through the blood of Christ, and have continual access through him, who is in the bosom of the Father.

And it should be remembered that, for the first three hundred years, and during which, by the confession of all, Christianity was most truly held, under dispersions, persecutions, and trials of the severest kinds—this persecuted condition of the Church absolutely precluded, and rendered utterly impossible, nearly all the forms and ceremonies which the Romanists afterwards canonized, and which Dr. Pusey and his friends would now exalt into a sacramental principle. The early Christians evinced a fulness of faith, hope, and charity, *under their supposed disadvantages in the want of forms*, which has become the emulation of all succeeding ages, and which proves this view of forms to be *suppositious*. And if, for our sins, the Church should again be subjected to such persecutions, and, in judgment upon *idolized* forms, the forms themselves should be abolished, we doubt not that the servants of God would be found cleaving steadfastly to him, for whose service alone these forms were appointed—taking him for their all in all—cleaving to him alone.

But we do hope that Dr. Pusey and his friends have brought their opinions to that practical issue which may teach them, on the one hand, that there are evils in the Papacy against which it is necessary to PROTEST; and, on the other, that separation from the Papacy is necessary, as long as the Romanists obstinately refuse to REFORM.

ART. II.—*Some Account of My Cousin Nicholas.* By THOMAS INGOLDSBY, Esq. To which is added, *The Rubber of Life.* 3 vols. London: Bentley. 1841.

2. *The Trustee.* 3 vols. London: Colburn. 1841.

SOME little time ago we entered on a question, which at first appeared rather out of our way, viz., the manner in which the Church and her ministers had been handled by modern novelists; we say, a little out of our way, because there were those who believed that novels were such very insignificant things, that it mattered little or nothing what they said. We showed how very fallacious was such an opinion—how many persons might, by fair statistical details, be supposed influenced more or less in their sentiments by their daily supply from the circulating library; and we pointed out what ought to have been a self-evident fact, that it behoved the guardians of public education, of public religion, to look to the kind of pabulum thus presented to the public mind.

We have no hesitation in saying, that so much harm has been done by modern novels, and comparatively so little good, that we really wish there were no such things. But as they are, and as Messrs. Colburn and Bentley will still continue to publish new ones at the rate of three per week during the season, we shall take the present opportunity of saying a few words as to their moral and political tendencies.

No one who has contemplated the sour Whigs, half madmen, half brigands, whom Sir Edward delighteth to honour, and who are equally in favour with Horace Smith, from “Mordaunt” and “Gale Middleton,” down to “Eugene Aram”—no one who contemplates the heroes of Mr. Harrison Ainsworth, the “Dick Turpins” and “Jack Sheppards,” will fail to perceive that in all these, and many similar cases, there is a determined purpose to whitewash error, to palliate vice, and make crime a mere accident. We know well that the writers we refer to would repudiate with disdain any such design; but they have pandered to a depraved appetite for excitement, and they have felt or imagined that such books only *would sell*—

——“Quid non mortalia pectora cogis
Auri sacra fames!”

And for this degrading consideration, or the scarcely less degrading one of temporary popularity, have they bartered their opportunities of usefulness, and spread poison through the circle of their influence.

We spoke, in the article to which we have before referred, of

the way in which novels may be said to fill the place of the sayists and the dramatists of earlier times; but we said, at the same time, that we wished there were no such things. We do not, with the Calvinistic divines of our day, consider the reading a novel a very dangerous amusement, and the writing of one something very like a deadly sin; but we think that the benefits conferred on society by a good novel far less than the evil inflicted by a bad one. And then we have also to consider, that, for one good, there are at least ten bad ones published. If the mass of works of fiction could be distilled, and the moral of the whole extracted, would it be a good or a bad one? And let it not for a moment be forgotten, that there are very many thousands in England who read every novel as it comes out, and who *never read anything else*. These persons belong to the higher and middle classes of society, and the effect on both is anything rather than beneficial. We find trade and tradesmen sneered at with ineffable insolence, and this too in a nation which Napoleon rightly denominated "*une nation boutiquière*." We find refinement of mind, as well as of manners, made the exclusive property of the titled; and, moreover, this very class insulted and libelled, by being represented as foppish, conceited, and immoral. Now, where fashion is the reigning idol, she is an unusually imperious one: the merchant may be induced to renounce his pursuit after wealth, and the statesman his after power; but the votary of fashion bows down to a sterner divinity, who, while she seems no stronger than a flower-leaf wafted on the summer wind, yet holds him in chains that he dares not—nay, cannot break. The middle classes in this country take their lease of fashion from novels: we need say no more; the mischief must be apparent at once. But, alas! it does not end here; the very creators of fashion are injuriously affected by these same works; held up to them as in a magnifying mirror, they see their own grandeur—they see how they are worshipped as divinities by the silly crowd below them, and that, too, exactly in the inverse proportion to their real good qualities. Thus they are taught to look on themselves as a higher order of beings than their brethren, and led to value themselves most highly on that which is least valuable. We know that there is an ever ready reply to all this, viz., that there is too much good sense in the English character to admit of such extensive mischief; but the mischief is done, and the question remains—who or what does it? The great bulk of novel readers are females; and to them such impressions are peculiarly mischievous: for, first, they are naturally more sensitive, more impressible, than the other sex; and, secondly, their engagements are of a less

engrossing character—they have more time as well as more inclination to indulge in the reveries of fiction. The person, too, who is accustomed to read three novels per week, will read three novels per week; and as three good ones are not produced, he or she must be content with three bad ones; and as Pistol ate and swore, so may they read and grumble—grumble, but still read.

The question before us is one of morals; and we must, therefore, take into our consideration the avowed object of the novelist; it is to depict *life*—to give us “*veluti in speculum*” a representation of ourselves—to laugh us out of our follies—to scourge us out of our vices—to encourage virtue, by giving a natural delineation of its success—and to vindicate the justice of Providence, by exhibiting the continual misery of the criminal. This is a noble design; but how has it been executed? Let us look to Fielding and Smollett: what attractive heroes were theirs! what pleasant scoundrels! “Roderick Random” and “Tom Jones” were made up of splendid vices! They possessed neither temperance, soberness, nor chastity; they never attempted to live piously and godly in this world. Of the cardinal virtues they took one, and of the seven deadly sins all but two: and yet so has the genius of the novelists won upon us, that we are not angry at their “*cscapades*”—we sympathize with them in their richly-deserved tribulation, and rejoice in the final, though unmerited happiness which crowns the story.

There is one novel which, though greatly admired, has ever appeared to us one of the vilest of all vile publications—we allude to “Peregrine Pickle,” who is depicted as a being without any virtue; for even honour and generosity, those “*heroic qualities*,” are wanting here; yet it was evidently Smollett’s object to make him a favourite with the reader, and doubtless with some he succeeds. After having said thus much of the two chiefs among our elder novelists, we shall at once allow that there is far less grossness, and quite as much sound morality, in the writings which every week come forth from Burlington-street and Great Marlborough-street. Captain Marryatt may be read after Smollett, and Scott after anybody. We do not, indeed, exactly know whether we ought not to exclude Scott and James from all censure. Historical novels, not having to do with the ephemeral fashions and interests of the day, bear only indirectly on society, and scarcely at all, save when they touch on events, the results of which are not yet worked out;—such an event was the Reformation; and we have taken up “The Trustee,” because it treats rather largely on the characters of those who were the immediate actors in that wonderful series of transactions; but to this we shall come by-and-by. The first book on our list is

"Some Account of my Cousin Nicholas," by Thomas Ingoldsby, Esq.—*aut quocunque alio nomine gaudet*. Who is there who has not laughed over the Ingoldsby Legends? decidedly the cleverest book that has issued from the press for many years; making, indeed, too free with topics hardly meet for mirth, but compelling our laughter, even when we disapprove. Thomas Ingoldsby has given us a prose book, and we may safely say of it, that it contains no harm, but an amazing fund of amusement. We have, however, *en passant*, one fault to find, viz., that My Cousin Nicholas is far too great a rascal. Human nature never did produce such a character; and human nature is not so very white that she can afford license to Mr. Ingoldsby to give her an additional coat of blacking. This, too, detracts from the moral of the story; for when the knave of the piece is too decided—too total a knave—he is taken out of the class of *possible*, much more of *probable*, characters, and no lesson is read to us by his punishment. The general unlikeness to ourselves is so great, that we do not perceive that, in *some points*, there is a similarity. The same remarks apply to "The Trustee," in which one Sir Richard Waring "does the wicked" to an unprecedented extent. Scott's Rashleigh Osbaldistone is another instance in point; and James's Sir Payan Wileton is another. We object, too, on the same ground, to monsters of perfection. Stafford, in "My Cousin Nicholas," and Walter Armistead, in "The Trustee," are human beings without human frailties, the latter especially. But we must now introduce to our readers some of the characters which appear in these volumes. One of the great charms of "My Cousin Nicholas" is to be found in the exquisite tact with which the estimable author lashes the "Liberals" whenever (and this is by no means unfrequently) he finds a fitting occasion. Of the insolent demagogue whose monument disgraces Guildhall we have a characteristic anecdote:—

"It is recorded of a right worshipful citizen, who thrice filled the civic chair of the greatest corporation in the world, and was honoured by his fellow-citizens, at his decease, with a monument erected to his memory, at the public expense, and which still forms a principal ornament of that very Guildhall which had so often been the scene of his triumphs—it is on record, I say, that he once overwhelmed a prime minister by an energetic declaration, that '*them there facts is stubborn things!*' Sir Oliver Bullwinkle could no more invalidate the force of Alderman Beckford's axiom than could the premier."

Nor do the absurdities of the Tories escape the eye of one so keenly alive to the ludicrous. Let us select a specimen:—

"A morning paper, of high Tory principles, had copied from the
VOL. XI.—U

Sussex Conservative a formidable paragraph, to which, by way of 'gracing its tale with decent horror,' it had prefixed the words, 'Atrocious outrage, and horrible violation of the sanctuaries of the dead.'

"The account which followed was dated from Brighton, and stated, in substance, that, in the dusk of the preceding evening, a truculent looking ruffian had been detected in the very act of carrying on his disgusting trade of a resurrectionist, in the very church-yard of that marine metropolis: that, being hotly pursued, he had excited the greatest alarm and consternation among the elegant promenaders of the Steine, by running the whole length of that fashionable lounge with the dead body of a child under his arm, the bare sight of whose projecting legs had, *inter alia maxime deflenda*, frightened the Hon. Mrs. Faddle into fits, and would, it was to be feared, from her 'interesting situation,' effect a change in the succession to the earldom of Fiddlefumkin. It was gratifying, however, 'to be able to assure their readers' that 'the monster' was eventually secured by the 'intrepidity of Mrs. Martha Gun,' and conveyed, with the *corpus delicti* upon him, to the nearest justice of the peace. On his examination before the magistrate, he was fully identified as a distinguished Radical Reformer, and a leading member of lodge No. 275 of the Grand National Consolidated Trades' Union. The 'article' concluded with an animated apostrophe on the increasing depravity and licentiousness of the lower orders."

But it formed no part of Mr. Ingoldsby's plan to let the "Liberals" enjoy this stroke, for we immediately have an exquisitely humorous pendant to the picture in what follows:—

"A 'Liberal' journal, of the same date, gave a different version of the same story, extracted from the *Brighthelmstone Independent*, and headed, in what are technically called 'small caps'—THE TORIES AGAIN!!—INFAMOUS ATTACK ON THE RIGHTS OF THE PUBLIC!!!

"One of 'those hereditary nuisances,' who so arrogantly 'tyrannize over the people,' had, according to the *liberal* statement, committed a daring and felonious robbery upon an eminent dealer in all kinds of spirituous liquors.

"This '*gentleman*, for so he called himself, and boasted that he belonged to a noble (!!) family,' in his sheer, wanton, 'aristocratical love of oppressing the useful classes,' had snatched up, and run away with, a bran new Jolly Bacchus, just come home from the painter's, and about to be placed astride upon a barrel over the door of Mr. Juniper's *emporium*.

"The 'world was challenged' to 'ransack the annals' of Nero and Nadir Schah for a parallel to the 'heartless and insolent barbarity' of thus wresting from an 'honest operative' the emblem of his calling, and 'opposing the march of intellect,' by depriving 'the people' of 'a guide to useful knowledge,' which taught them where to apply for consolation 'under the miseries inflicted on them by peers and parsons.'

"'Dukes and princes, as they styled themselves,' were, it was added, *always* committing 'outrages on the people,' by their 'larks;' and 'it was notorious,' that, when the 'h—l-born minister, Pitt,' was in office,

a lantern had been tied to an old woman's tail in Pall-mall by the hands of royalty itself; but 'the people' would 'no longer be trampled upon'—'the time was come,' &c. &c.

"It was 'much to be lamented' that 'several operatives,' occupied at the moment in partaking of certain choice compounds, had suffered severely from the breaking of a large case bottle of the oil of vitriol, which *happened* to be in the shop, and was overturned in the first rush after the fugitive, who, bolting across the Steine, with his prize under his arm, would doubtless have escaped with it altogether, had he not, by the greatest good fortune, run against a lady who was crying mackerel, knocked her down, and rolled over her into the channel.

"The examination, it was added, was strictly private, and the delinquent had 'received permission to speak to the prosecutor;' but the editor 'had authority to state,' that all attempts at compromise *would have been* indignantly rejected by the truly patriotic Mr. Juniper, but that he was induced to relinquish farther proceedings by the reflection that, as the painter's bill had not been paid, he could not conscientiously swear the image of the son of Semele to be his own property; the culprit, therefore, was of course 'discharged with an admonition.'

"We should ill perform our duty to the public (said the *Bright-helmstone Independent*) were we to refrain from publishing the name of the delinquent; and this we should undoubtedly do had it not unluckily escaped our reporter's memory; we have reason, however, to believe that he was identified as the heir to a baronetcy.'

"The whole was wound up *en règle* by an elaborate *eulogium* on the virtues of 'producers,' and an *exposé* of the practical inconvenience of having such things as a House of Peers and a Bench of Bishops, without whose corrupt influence none of these 'larks' would be entered into."

We shall make one more extract of the same kind; it is an announcement, in the morning papers, of a marriage. First, then, for the *facts*, as given by the *Morning Post*, correctly:—

"At length, after a proper proportion of these pilot balloons had sufficiently informed the expectant public which way the wind was blowing, the *Morning Post* put forth the following clincher:—

"H. M. S. the *Superb*, 74, Hon. Captain Loblolly, has been ordered round to * * *, where she will take on board the Right Rev. the new Bishop of Bengal. His lordship was consecrated on Sunday, the 4th instant, in the chapel appertaining to the Archiepiscopal Palace, at Lambeth, and is about to embark forthwith, with his amiable family, for the important diocese over which he has been called upon to preside.

"On his way to the coast his lordship will visit Underdown-hall, the seat of Sir Oliver Bullwinkle, Bart., for the express purpose of solemnizing the marriage ceremony between Charles Stafford, Esq., nephew to the hospitable proprietor of the mansion, and his cousin, the Hon. Amelia Stafford, the beautiful and accomplished heiress of Lord Viscount Manningham, K.B., late Governor General, &c. &c.

"Immediately after the ceremony the right reverend prelate will proceed to the place of embarkation, while the happy couple will set

out for Belvoir Abbey, on the banks of the Wye, the splendid domain recently purchased by the noble nabob from the heirs of the late Lord Cumberville.' "

Next for the Sunday Liberal paper :—

" Three days subsequently, a Sunday paper, piquing itself, and justly, on the priority of its intelligence and the accuracy of its details, had a paragraph differing slightly from the former.

" ' The new Bishop of Bengal is, we are credibly informed, about to proceed to his diocese in the West Indies, where his lordship has long been most anxiously expected, though we have good reason to believe that few persons, till lately, have been aware of his appointment.

" ' His lordship will embark in the *Skeleton*, hired transport, Captain Coffin commander ;—and here we cannot help calling the attention of the public to the disgraceful parsimony of Ministers in not placing a Government vessel at the right reverend prelate's disposal ; though, as profuse expenditure can never be justified, they are quite right, after all, in refusing to add to the burthens of the country for the convenience of a bloated hierarchy—unless, indeed, there should be good reason for the contrary, which we are inclined to think may possibly be the case.

" ' His lordship has been for some time on a visit at Bullwinkle-place, the residence of Oliver Underdown, Esq., whose elegant and accomplished daughter is about to bestow her hand and immense fortune, including the fine estate of Thingumbob Hall, bequeathed to her by her uncle, the late Lord Thingumdiddle, upon Viscount Manningham. Gunter has exhausted all his taste in the composition of the bride-cake, which the bishop probably took down with him in his carriage ; unless, indeed—as we have been assured is the case—his lordship, on this occasion, travelled down on horseback, followed by a single groom.'

" The former announcement of the two, if less particular, was, in substance, the most correct."

Subsequently the account in the Sunday paper was corrected as follows :—

" We announced in our last (exclusively) an approaching marriage in high life, which has since taken place. By an inadvertency we were led into a trifling error as to the name of the bride, who is the Hon. Amelia Manningham, daughter of Viscount Stafford, and who was, on this happy occasion, united in the flowery bands of Hymen to her only surviving relative, Mr. Charles Bullwinkle, of Underdown Hall.

" The Bishop of Bengal did not, we understand, perform the ceremony, having been obliged to depart for Bengal (which is not in the West, but in the East Indies, as our readers will find by referring to the map in Guthrie's Geographical Grammar) on the preceding evening. His lordship sailed in the *Superb*, 74, Captain Fuggles (and not in the *Skeleton*, Captain Coffin, which is ordered to Demerara, in New Brunswick, with overland despatches) ; the gratifying task consequently devolved upon the exemplary vicar of Underdown, the Rev. Timothy

Bustle, D.D., late Fellow of Oriel College, Cambridge, by whom the ceremony *was* performed; so that *we were right in the main*.

"The splendid *trousseau* of the bride is the admiration of all who have been so fortunate as to see it. We consider it *extremely wrong* thus idly to lavish on an individual what would support a hundred poor families for a twelvemonth; but if the happy pair can by such an expenditure encourage industry, and put bread into the mouths of our starving manufacturers, we think, after all, that nevertheless they may very possibly be *quite right*."

We abstain from giving any analysis of the story of this very amusing book, because some years ago it appeared, in portions, in *Blackwood's Magazine*; but we have selected it for the subject of a review because the author has avoided the errors of his contemporaries. Virtue is, throughout, put in an amiable light. The story is not *splendide mendax*; and though some of the adventures are a little too romantic, and some of the characters a little too good or a little too evil for this mortal life, yet it is a fair representation, taken as a whole. It is written by a man who knows the world, and who has no desire to misrepresent it. We feel that, as the characters develop themselves, we are drawn to love the good and to hate the evil: and, moreover, there is here none of that deification of the human intellect which distinguishes Horace Smith and Sir Edward Lytton Bulwer: there is none of the heartlessness of Mrs. Gore—none of the flippancy of the younger D'Israeli; while, at the same time, there is talent far more than equal to theirs. The name of Mrs. Gore brings to our recollection that we have, at this moment, a very large number of female writers, nearly all of whom have, at some time or other, tried their skill in romance. Mrs. Trollope is the most determinedly and exclusively English of them all; and her "Jonathan Jefferson Whitlaw" is sufficient to redeem her from the consequences even of "The Vicar of Wrexhill." Perhaps, all things considered, Miss Pardoe may ere long be placed at the head of living female writers. Johanna Baillie writes no more; and Miss Mitford, exquisite as are her descriptions, is a religionless writer. Of Miss Martineau we will only say, with a contemporary—

"They may talk about checks and prevention—

They may talk about labour and land;

'Tis a pity cerulean virgins

Talk of things that they don't understand."

But Miss Pardoe possesses both high talent and high principle, and in her "Mardens and Daventrys" has given us an earnest of what she can do in this genre. To her we look for much, for she has many advantages. By birth a gentlewoman,

she is placed above the necessity of writing for bread: she has travelled, and seen the highest society of foreign lands; and she is young. (Let no one trust the portrait attached to "The City of the Magyar.") We have, therefore, reason to hope that she will be long an ornament, and an increasingly bright one, to our literary horizon. "*Mais revenons.*"

We spoke of "The Trustee," and, while we read the book with interest, we cannot speak so highly of it as we have done of "My Cousin Nicholas." It is true that the works are so essentially different that any comparison must necessarily be absurd; but we would observe, that the one is a very good story of its kind—the other, though the class to which it belongs is somewhat higher, is yet not entitled to so high a rank in that class. The characters are described, instead of being developed; and the views of the writer, as to the causes and consequences of the Reformation, are exceeding incorrect, and even inconsistent one with another. The most interesting, as well as the best written, part of "The Trustee," is the introductory chapter, in which we have a sketch of Henry VIII., and his mode of governing Church and State. The writer falls into the vulgar error of denominating the Romanists *Catholics*, and supposes that the king was, in fact, the religion of the nation:—

"Had Henry been a Catholic, or a Protestant, or anything fixed and determinate, matters would have been much more easily arranged, and one portion, at least, of the kingdom would have jogged on comfortably in this royal track, while the other might have been banished, burned, or beggared into peaceful extermination. But as, by the royal will, all the souls in the kingdom must be shipped on board the Great Harry, which alone was judged capable of bearing them safely to port, and as no man could guess, by looking at the vane to-day, in what direction it would turn to-morrow, or form the slightest calculation whether, being a good Catholic this week, he might not find it necessary to be an equally good Protestant the next, and some yet uninvited amalgamation of the two the week after; so those, who desired a quiet possession of such good things as they now enjoyed, gave up all idea of controlling their own course, and followed unresistingly wherever their self-elected pilot should guide—making only a mental reservation, that, in case of miscarriage, he alone should be answerable for the consequences."

This idea is carried out still more erroneously in another passage, in which we are given to understand that the convocation were as completely slaves to Henry's decisions as his less learned subjects. Now the truth of the matter was, that Henry VIII. had studied scholastic divinity, and understood it well; and, as he was a man of powerful mind and acute understanding, he was no contemptible assistant to the bishops and

doctors who commenced, in his reign, the Anglican Reformation. We have no doubt that the king and the clergy were alike honest in what they decided, and that the first authorized works, which were favourable to the Reformation, represented the genuine sentiments both of the king and of the convocation. Some things, of course, had to be given up by some parties; but the author of "The Trustee" is a long way from the truth when he says—

"So he called a convocation, to settle a creed under his guidance, which should, like the bed of Procrustes, be applied to every conscience in the kingdom, and these were to be stretched or lopped, as the case might be, till they conformed to the standard.

"No one remonstrated—the convocation set to work, and, having fathomed the royal will, each party gave up some half score of essentials to retain the rest; till they ended by producing a strange piece of patchwork, which represented the faith of no man living, except Henry himself. Yet to doubt on any point of this was heresy, and to be punished accordingly, until some further enlightenment of the royal mind should lead to its correction, and make it criminal to assert that which it was now criminal to deny; when all good subjects were expected, like weathercocks, to veer at once, obedient to the breath of the sovereign wind directing them.

"It was truly beautiful to find in a monarch such a paternal solicitude for the highest interests of his subjects; and such was his love of truth (or of argument), that he would occasionally send for an imprisoned heretic, that he might, in his own royal person, confute his errors; for which purpose he would calmly plunge into most lengthened and abstruse disputations, to the wonder of the listeners, and the delight of the surrounding courtiers. If his opponent continued obstinately contumacious, it was but natural that he should refer him to the last and unanswerable argument of the stake; which, if he had not before deserved for his false opinions, he assuredly well merited now for his want of courtesy and loyalty."

Moreover, Henry, though despotic enough, was neither the mule nor the tiger that he is sometimes represented: his own sentiments changed, it is true, but so did those of Cranmer and of Ridley, and we find them all together becoming more and more enlightened, as the prejudices of education were gradually overcome. Nobody ever mentions the English Herod, as they are pleased to call him, without some allusions to his Blue-beard propensities. Our author, accordingly, lets fly an arrow at the same mark—

"In the meantime his domestic arrangements were of an equally eccentric and puzzling complication. He sturdily repudiated his Catholic wife, the sister of perhaps the most powerful sovereign in Europe, and bastardized her child, to marry a Protestant, the legitimacy of whose daughter it was declared treason to doubt. In a short time

it was declared equally treasonable to assert that daughter's legitimacy, his majesty having rid himself of her mother by the axe (as the best mode of avoiding adultery with her successor), and begotten to himself a long-desired son by a third wife.

"As this child was declared to be really legitimate, and the king had proved his impartiality by bastardizing one Catholic and one Protestant daughter, domestic affairs began to look smooth enough, and left him leisure for the embroilment of theology."

Now how stands the truth of the case? Certainly not to the king's credit—but not so bad as common opinion has it. He had six wives; one survived him, and one died in child-birth—of the remaining four one was most righteously executed, and of the two who were put away, one was perfectly satisfied with the king's conduct towards her. Thus, then, Henry VIII.'s marital enormities are confined to the two cases of Catherine of Arragon and Anna Boleyn. We think it hardly fair to suppose that he really had no scruples as to the former; and though the latter must ever be an object of our sympathy, and while we allow that the king had no right to take her life, yet she cannot be said to have been altogether undeserving of her fate. Her daughter, one of the haughtiest of women, never mentioned her mother—an unamiable trait, but one which proves that Elizabeth did not consider exactly in the same light in which modern Protestants do. Another exhibition of the same feeling towards the Reformers, which we have already mentioned, is given us in the passage following:—

"But when a people, sunk in that mental sloth which must necessarily result from the practice of for ages yielding implicitly to the care of others the souls intrusted to their own charge—when such a people see from the high places an attack made on all that they have been taught to consider most sacred, and their spiritual guides, the guardians of the sanctuary, in place of manfully defending their trust, truckle to the aggressor—when they behold also those new instructors, who boast a higher rule of conduct and a purer source of light, crouch equally at the feet of the earthly despot, and, by their time-serving compliances, prove that they fear more the anger of the king than the displeasure of the King of kings—what else can be expected from a people so circumstanced than that, first puzzled, then reckless, they should conclude the whole business to be a mere trick of worldly policy, and should first doubt, and then reject all they had learned from such inconsistent teachers?"

Surely the author, when he wrote this, must have forgotten *who* those venerable men were whom he thus characterizes. Was Latimer one who feared "more the anger of the king than the displeasure of the King of kings?"—was Ridley one who formed his faith upon any earthly model?—was Cranmer one

who meanly "truckled to the aggressor?" We are ashamed to have to ask such questions as these. Let us ask another—is the condemner of these "inconsistent teachers" a Papist, or perhaps, as *he* would call it, a Catholic? If so, his "Trustee" is a sad exposure of the party—if not, he must still bear the charge of being an "inconsistent teacher." Amidst all these faults, however, the book has considerable merits, and there are some truths happily expressed as to the state of this country during Henry's reign. What follows is exceedingly good:—

"True, there were a few men of nobler mould who preferred martyrdom itself to a dereliction of their principles; but those, belonging indifferently to both parties, seemed only to prove the honour of the man, and not the truth of his creed; while the severity of the punishment but fixed in wavering minds a stronger terror of the earthly scourge, before whom all consciences and all creeds appeared doomed alike to bow.

"But as the end is frequently necessary for the understanding of the beginning, so we in this day can trace, even in these unpromising circumstances, a proof of the manner in which the wisdom of God can force the very evil of man to work out the purposes of his own providence. Had the small body of the Reformers been set to their work in an undisturbed, unlettered Catholic land, how fearful had been the odds against them! The very name of heretic (for names go far with unthinking men) would have closed all doors and all hearts against them. But in the miscellaneous reign of Henry the title became 'familiar as household words,' and lost all its power, since he who was a Christian of the royal creed to-day, might, without any change of principles, be branded as a heretic to-morrow: and the word was soon understood to mean no more than one who differed from the royal confession of faith.

"Religion was in the multitude as metal is in the ore—concealed in the alloy of dross and earthly matter, and not to be made evident till the gross mass had been shattered and shaken from its rust of ages. The ground that had lain so long untilld must, to be rendered fruitful, be broken up by the unsparing plough, which, though all seems barren in its track, prepares the soil for the future harvest."

There is much force in our author's account of the king's conduct towards the Lincolnshire insurgents; and, as a fair specimen of his style of writing, we shall make one more short extract from the introductory chapter:—

"A restless feeling of dissatisfaction began to show itself, though without proceeding to any overt act. But when, at length, the Protestant Cromwell's commission, on the one hand, dipped deeply into the ecclesiastical coffers, at the same time that it closed many of the channels which had helped to fill them; and, on the other, robbed the people of many of their ancient holidays; then, indeed, the limits of endurance were felt to be past, and something vigorous must be

done. Whereupon the good Prior of Barlings got together twenty thousand men in Lincolnshire, who, when they looked at their own numbers, trembled to think how angry the king would be with them for banding themselves together in such force ; and sent him a very humble message, expressive of their devoted loyalty, yet gently hinting that they thought the ecclesiastical affairs of the country might be better managed.

“ But the spleen of the royal lion was not to be moved by such swine as these ; and he only showed his tusks, and, grimly smiling, told them to go about their business, and he would forgive them. Whereupon they took his advice and his pardon together, and left their leaders to be executed, or to try their fortunes further north, where a new insurrection was brewing.”

The tale is rather a complicated one, but the chief incidents are as follows :—Sir Edward Waring, a knight who was in some way implicated in one of the plots, or rather insurrections, during the reign of Henry VIII., leaves his two daughters, a priest, and a large sum of money with his cousin, one Richard Waring, a merchant at Hull, and goes abroad. Richard Waring, who has established himself as a kind of general banker and trustee, does, whenever he can do so, embezzle the property placed in his hands. He does this in the case of one Giles Armistead, who is hanged as a traitor, and whose son Walter is the hero of the tale. Sir Edward takes Walter Armistead with him abroad, where he cultivates innumerable virtues, and finds on his return that his mother is sorely oppressed by the merchant, now become Sir Richard Waring. He falls in love with Catherine, the elder of Sir Edward's two daughters ; and, in the meantime, the grandfather of these ladies dies, leaving a will by which he bequeaths to them all his possessions, in case of their legitimacy being proved. Sir Edward, it must be observed, ran away with their mother. Sir Richard has, in the meantime, become really a poor man, while all about him considered him immensely rich ; and he forms the design of marrying Catherine himself, and then, as her father had left with him proofs of her legitimacy, publishing it, and mending his own broken fortunes with the broad lands of Sir Thomas Overton. He sends the faithful, but simple-minded priest out of the way, and removes from Hull to Cornwall. While there—inasmuch as Walter Armistead had once, with the aid of a marvellous personage, yclept Scampering Jack, set the two young ladies at liberty when Sir Richard had locked them up—Sir Richard invokes a mightier demon than himself, and sends for one Francis d'Aguilar, a Dominican monk, to purge the village of heretics. Now, as all the Armisteads were Protestants, the design of the worthy knight was evident enough ; but his ward encounters the Dominican monk

by accident, and gets put down in his list of heretics. This by no means suits Sir Richard's plans, and his manœuvrings, in consequence, are very well told. While these events are transacting at the hall, the monk frightens to death a sister of Walter Armistead, already dying of consumption. This so greatly enrages Walter—and, it must be owned, not altogether without reason—that he runs after the monk up to the top of the house, and tries to throw him down. Sir Richard Waring sees the struggle, seizes a gun, and recollecting, that whichever he kills, it will be well for him, fires, and brings down Master Walter; and now the plot thickens. The hero is confined as a prisoner of the Church, and his betrothed in a condition not much more favourable; but Sir Edward Waring suddenly returns, and, for a moment, affairs seem to brighten. He, however, soon sinks beneath the skilful villany of Sir Richard, and the marriage of the latter with Katherine takes place. Immediately afterwards Scampering Jack again makes his appearance; and, as Walter has escaped and been retaken, nothing more is necessary to complete Sir Richard's triumph than that the aforesaid Jack should be laid by the heels. This is now done, and accordingly knavery is in the ascendant; but a new part is taken by an old rascal, and John Ferrett, Sir Richard's secretary, who has been already false to his master, finds means to set both Walter and Jack at liberty. Charles Waring, the only child of Sir Richard, a fine noble fellow, disguises himself as Walter, to mislead the latter's pursuers, and only discovers himself when he and Ferrett, who is with him, are being fired upon. Ferrett is killed, and Sir Richard Waring, seeing the danger, and supposing the death of his son, is struck with insanity, and rushes over a precipice into the sea. After this, everything is, of course, *more novelistarum*, speedily arranged. Charles Waring escapes by a miracle, and is married to Rose, the younger daughter of Sir Edward Waring. Walter Armistead attaches to himself the elder; and Scampering Jack is proved to be a son of Sir Richard by a former wife, *who was yet living*; so that Sir Richard aforesaid added not only bigamy, but trigamy to his already rather long catalogue of sins. One scene towards the close, though very melo-dramatic, we shall extract. It is the last *ruse* of Father Francis d'Aguilar on behalf of his Church:—

“He was interrupted by the opening of the door, when a servant, flushed and breathless with excitement, rushed into the room, bearing a letter in his hand. It was directed to Sir Richard Waring, and had been brought by a messenger direct from London, who said that it bore most important tidings, and that his orders were to ride as if for life.

“Jack seized the letter. To those in desperate conditions every un-

expected event suggests a possibility of hope ; and he who had so recently announced himself Sir Richard's representative had little hesitation in keeping up the character by breaking his seal.

" 'Why am I not obeyed ? (shouted the impatient friar). Men, there, assist my officer in the execution of his duty. In the Queen's name I charge you !'

" 'Stop ! stop ! (said Jack, his voice trembling so that he could scarcely give utterance to his words, while his eyes eagerly devoured the paper in his hand)—Stop just one minute. In the Queen's name, I think you said, good friar. What Queen—what Queen ?'

" 'The Queen of England, knave. Why this fool's question ?'

" 'Ay—but her name ? The Queen of England has got a name, I suppose ?'

" 'You read Queen Mary's name to my commission.'

" For the first time raising his eyes from the letter, Jack shot a quite bright glance upon the friar, while, with difficulty restraining his exultation, he answered—

" 'Go home, and get yourself a fresh commission then, for that is out of date. I know of no Queen Mary. I owe allegiance to a different sovereign—to Queen *Elizabeth*—and neither I, nor any here, will give it to another !'

" All stood astonished ; but Jack, reverting to the letter, continued, 'I have not finished it yet—but you shall hear, as far as I have gone ; and he hurriedly ran over the words—

" 'To my singular good friend, Sir Richard Waring'—a friend of his, you see—'You will perhaps have already heard of the death of our most gracious sovereign the Lady Mary ; yet I preferred being second with the news, if by a day or two of delay I might be able to add for your guidance the temper of her successor, which now begins to show itself. The Lady Elizabeth has been received by all as of unquestioned title.'

" 'Long live Queen Elizabeth !' shouted Jack, interrupting his reading to vent his overflowing loyalty ; and a score of voices catching up the cry, the walls rang with the shouts of 'Long live Queen Elizabeth !' "

We shall add nothing to what we have said of this novel ; it belongs to the better and higher class of fiction, and we are strongly inclined to think that its faults arise more from want of practice than from want of power. There is, however, another kind of novel to which we have already briefly alluded, and on which we shall now say a little more. We do not excuse the immoral tendency of books which yet appeal to noble sympathies, and are filled with proofs of a lofty, though perverted intellect. We could name some novels which would bear this character ; perhaps Godwin's would not entirely escape. We do not excuse the immoral tendency of novels written about, and addressed to, the aristocracy, by their butlers and lady's maids ; and still less those which are written by such persons as Mrs. Gore.

But, while we do not excuse these, we are willing to make allowance for the defective education and obtuse moral perceptions of their authors and authoresses. When, however, we see individuals descending from the high place which they might claim, as friends of virtue and teachers of morality, to seek, among the dregs of vice and infamy, somewhat more exciting to the poisoned, and therefore diseased state of public taste, we at once tear away every veil of palliation, and expose the atrocity of the writers in terms as energetic as we can command. We need not say that we now allude to the novelists of the Jack Sheppard school. One of the very worst fruits of the French revolution was the depravation of the press: Louvet took the place of Chateaubriand; and in the present time murder, arson, and adultery, are not sufficiently *exciting* to make a novel saleable—it must be seasoned with a little blasphemy, incest, and parricide.

We had hoped that our insular position would have, in some respects, preserved our insular virtue. But Mr. Ainsworth seems determined that all the horrors and abominations of the very worst school of French authorship shall be poured out, to corrupt the low, the poor, and the ignorant. Fortunately we have a dramatic censorship, or, doubtless, Mr. Ainsworth and his admirers would introduce a few continental novelties in this line also. “Le Roi s’amuse,” and “Lucrece Borgia,” would be exhibited to an Ainsworthized audience; and all virtue, as well as all religion, be publicly held up to ridicule. Nay, even while we are writing this, proof is brought before us that this mischief is done; and we exhibit, alas! not the assertions of interested parties, but the *Report of the Inspector of Prisons*. What follows is a part of the examinations of various boys attending the prison school of the New Bailey, Manchester:—

“J. W. (aged 15): The boys at the factory were singing ‘Nix my dolly, pals,’ and I heard a great talk in the factory about it, and this made me pay sixpence at the playhouse to hear it.”—[This is the slang song of a parcel of thieves in the play of Jack Sheppard.]

“J. L. (aged 14): The first time I was ever at the theatre was to see Jack Sheppard. There were two or three boys near to the house who were going, and they asked me. Mother said I might go once, but not more. I took sixpence from the money I used to lay up weekly for clothes. The next time I went, which was the week after, I borrowed the money from a boy: I returned it to him the Saturday after. I then went many times. I took the money from my mother out of her pocket as she was sitting down, and I beside her. There was more than sixpence in her pocket. I got a great love for the theatre, and stole from people often to get there. I thought this Jack Sheppard was a clever fellow for making his escape and robbing his

master. If I could get out of gaol I think I should be as clever as him ; but, after all his exploits, he got done at last. I have had the book out of a library at Dole Field. I had paid twopence a book for three volumes. I also got Richard Turpin in two volumes, and paid the same."

We hope after this that we shall have no more objections made to a religious education for the children of the poor, in order that the Church Catechism may, as far as possible, neutralize the instructions of Mr. Ainsworth, and teach the poor boys to keep their hands from picking and stealing. Let us see some more—

"H. C. (aged 15): When we came to Manchester, I went to the play, and saw Jack Sheppard the first night it came out. There were pictures of him about the streets on boards, and on the walls ; one of them was his picking a pocket in the church. I liked Jack Sheppard much. I had not been in prison then. I was employed in a warehouse at six shillings and sixpence a week, and was allowed sixpence out of it for myself, and with that I went regularly to the play. I saw Jack Sheppard afterwards four times in one week. I got the money out of my money-bag by stealth, and without my master's knowledge. I once borrowed ten shillings in my mother's name from Mrs. —, a shopkeeper, with whom she used to deal ; I went to the play with it. Mother found it out about a month afterwards, and beat me, but did not tell my father ; he does not know it now. I then took a watch, and pawned it for ten shillings, and was found out, and sent here for two months. It is not six months since I left prison ; I have been to the play since, and am now here on suspicion of stealing a gold watch.

"J. M'D. (aged 15): I have heard of Jack Sheppard : a lad whom I know told me of it, who had seen it, and said it was rare fun to see him break out of prison.

"J. L. (aged 11): Have been to the play twice, and saw Jack Sheppard. Went with my brother the first time, and by myself the second. I took the money to go a second time out of my mother's house, off the chimney-piece, where she had left a sixpence. It was the first night Jack Sheppard was played. There was a great talk about it, and there were nice pictures about it all over the walls. I thought him a very clever fellow ; but Blueskin made the most fun. I first went to the markets, and begun by stealing apples. I also knew a lad, —, who has been transported, and went with him two or three times. The most I ever got was ten shillings out of a till."

But the inspector shall speak for himself. After making some reference to a former report on the same melancholy topic, he says,—

"A subsequent five years' experience has satisfied me how greatly I underrated the mischievous effects which result from vitiating and corrupting public amusements. The passion for the theatre among the children of the humbler classes, in large towns, is of itself the most

common impulse to crime. The first act is generally the subtracting of pence from the shelves, drawers, and indeed the persons of their parents or relations, for the purpose of obtaining admission to some low theatre or amusement, of which they have heard the most captivating descriptions. This Rubicon once passed, neither menaces nor blows are of avail. Late hours, loose associates, abandonment of home, robbery from the person and shops, and utter vagabondism, follow in a quickness of succession quite lamentable. Perhaps in no other town in the United Kingdom has the demoralizing influence of low theatres and amusements, upon children, been so decidedly experienced as at Liverpool. The number of children frequenting the Sanspareil, the Liver, and other theatres of a still lower description, is almost incredible. The streets in front, and the avenues leading to them, may be seen, on the nights of performance, occupied by crowds of boys, who have not even been able to possess themselves of the few pence required to obtain admission. I cannot forbear describing, as a sample, one place of amusement, called the Penny Hop, in Hood-street, to which the admission is one penny, and where two or three series of performances take place the same evening. It consists of a spacious room, fitted up in the rudest manner, with a stage, and seats on an inclined plane; the access to it is through a dark passage and up a ladder staircase. On one occasion I was present, and found the audience to consist almost exclusively of boys and girls of the very lowest description, many without shoes or stockings, and to the number of one hundred and fifty. As they were descending the ladder, at the termination of the performance, I pointed out to the superintendent of police, who accompanied me, a well-dressed youth among the number, who proved to be the son of a respectable tradesman, and was delivered over to his parents. I had some conversation with the persons in the interior who appeared to have the management; and they stated, in answer to my questions, that the theatre was almost always filled, and with boys; that they had attempted to play Jack Sheppard, but in consequence of the frequent interruptions from the audience, who seemed all to wish to take a part in the performance, they were obliged to give it up."

There is mention made here of a youth of respectable connections, who was found among the wretched children at this "Penny Hop." It may not be without utility to take a few passages from the examination of such a youth, who, from reading Mr. Ainsworth's book, and seeing its scenes represented, was led into crime:—

"J. H. (18): I had just entered into the fifth year of my apprenticeship, and was to receive seven shillings a week, which had been raised from two shillings and sixpence. I read Jack Sheppard about five months before I began the robberies. I saw Jack Sheppard played twice. It excited in my mind an inclination to imitate him: the part was well acted at the play. I read how he got into places; and I had a wish to try if I could do the same. The play made the

greatest impression on my mind. A few weeks after I saw the play I committed the first robbery. When the scene is hoisted he is carving his name on a beam which goes across the shop. I wrote 'Jack Sheppard' on the shop beam, just as it was in the play. It occurred to my mind that his trade was like my own—a carpenter. I often thought about it when I was at work. J. and me were always thinking and talking about it at the shop. Sheppard used to follow carding, and that set us 'agaite.' ”

After reciting various robberies committed by himself and companions, this lad says—

“ We continued to talk about Jack Sheppard, and we were getting like Jack and his companions.”

We will take a few other extracts from the report, which will tend to throw still more light on the deplorable subject which we have taken in hand to discuss:—

“ J. S. (17): Have only been three times to the theatre. Can't recollect the name of the first play; the second was Jack Sheppard, and the third was Jack Sheppard. I thought Jack Sheppard a fine, sharp fellow. The first place we broke into was Pollard's warehouse, in Oldham-street. This was shortly after I saw the play. H. often compared us to Jack Sheppard and his comrades; he said we had gone through as much as Jack Sheppard very near. My wages were five shillings a week. I have three sisters and one brother. We live in comfort at home. I have food and clothing enough, and kind parents. My parents used to talk to me, and cautioned me against bad company; I always thought they could see something going wrong. When my parents knew I had been to see Jack Sheppard, they gave me a good talking to, and said I could not have gone to a much worse thing.

“ J. C. (17): The first beginning of my bad conduct was seeing a play acted at the theatre in Fishergate; and then we (*i. e.*, H. S. and J.) started a making it up how we could break into places. This play was about a highwayman; so we thought we would try to do as he did. H. was the first to begin talking about it. We thought it was a better way of getting money than working. We often talked about Jack Sheppard, and said we should like to be like him. We often said we thought we were good Jack Sheppards. H. often used to say he thought we had done almost as much as Jack Sheppard. We also saw Jack Sheppard acted at the theatre in Chadwick's Orchard. A great many lads and girls from the factories went to see it at Chadwick's Orchard. The admission at Chadwick's Orchard was threepence; at Fishergate, sixpence. We once saved some of the money we got at my master's, thinking of going to the Liverpool races; but we spent it K.'s. Whenever Jack Sheppard did a clever thing, at either of the theatres, the people used to clap and applaud; it was that clapping that set me off a good deal. My master found me in clothes, and meat, and 'spending brass:' some weeks one shilling—some sixpence. Master was good-natured and kind. My parents

never suspected that anything was going wrong. Kept to my work all this time."

Among ninety-one boys examined, most of them had stolen money to witness the representation of Jack Sheppard.

"No. 51 (aged 19): It was the theatres that first created in me a desire to steal, and the cause of my getting into bad company. I have seen Jack Sheppard performed. I think it will be the means of inducing boys to copy his tricks. I have read his life: many boys have it.

"No. 52 (18): I have seen Jack Sheppard performed. I do not recollect any particular part that pleased me most: he was a clever fellow.

"No. 53: I am sure, had I never known the theatres, I should have been quite a different character at this day. I have heard Jack Sheppard performed. I was very fond of it. I had his life, but some boy took it from me; most boys have his life.

"No. 64 (19): I am sure the theatres would bring any youngsters to ruin: they don't care where they get the money, so that they do but get it to join their companions. I was very fond of seeing Jack Sheppard performed. I have read his life. I bought it.

"No. 68 (16): I have seen Jack Sheppard performed; I think there is none like him; but prisons are not so easy to get out at this day, or else I believe there might be some as clever as Jack.

"No. 69 (18): I have seen Jack Sheppard performed: I am sure, if anything, it encouraged me to commit greater crimes.

"No. 70 (18): I have seen Jack Sheppard performed; I thought he was a capital example for those that followed the trade. I did not learn much at the sight myself, but I think it was very likely to encourage younger boys.

"No. 83 (14): I have seen Jack Sheppard performed; thought it was very nice, and if I was only as clever, I should be thought one of the best of thieves. I thought that part the cleverest where he takes the purse from the lady; also the taking the snuff-box from Lady Trafford was very good.

"No. 87 (21): I have seen Jack Sheppard performed; I noticed them picking one another's pockets upon the stage; it gave every one a great insight how to do it. If I did not know how to do such tricks when I went into the theatre, I am sure I should when I came out. I am sure it would be a very great inducement for boys to imitate the example shown.

"No. 18 (18): I have seen Jack Sheppard performed three times at the Sanspareil, and twice at the Liver. I thought it was a very fine thing for lads like me, to show us how to manage."

We shall now dismiss the Report, and if any virtuous admirer, either of Mr. Ainsworth or of Jack Sheppard, or peradventure of both, should tell us that Mr. Ainsworth is not answerable for the effects of the theatrical representation, we reply that, morally, he is responsible, inasmuch as if he had not resuscitated the hanged ruffian of former days, by his atrocious novel, nobody

would have brought the wretch on the stage. Moreover, it will be seen, that the *reading of Mr. Ainsworth's book* has produced as bad effects as the witnessing of the stupid play founded upon it.

We perceive, too, with great pleasure, that the *Times* has raised its potent voice against this evil; and we are the more rejoiced at this, because that journal is read by *all* classes, from the peer to the pot-boy. So admirable are some of its late remarks, that we shall, without hesitation, strengthen our own views, by transferring to our pages the arguments which have principally struck us. Speaking of the absurd, and more than absurd, sympathy with notorious criminals, which has of late gained ground among us, the editor alludes in the following terms to the effects of the modern school of novels:—

“In the first place, if we look to our popular literature, without going back to the times of Godwin, Shelley, and Byron (men whose extreme principles were openly avowed, and put the world in a great degree upon its guard against them)—if we look back to that class of writings in our own day which is more especially dedicated to the amusement of the people, and placed within the reach of the most numerous class of readers, we shall find a vast and increasing amount of this anti-moral leaven. At the head of living British novelists, or thereabouts [we beg to protest against any such idea—Ed. C. E. Q.], most persons would place the ex-member for Lincoln—a gentleman who received a baronetcy from the same hands which presented Robert Owen to the Queen. We plead guilty to having read several of this gentleman's works, which seem expressly written to show that a man may commit crimes of the deepest dye, without being a whit the less amiable, high-minded, or even virtuous. His earliest work, called ‘Falkland,’ is the history of an adulterer, the most noble and generous of mankind, whom circumstances of a peculiar nature lead to seduce the wife of his friend. A second, entitled ‘Paul Clifford,’ represents another of these perfect specimens of humanity as the captain of a band of highwaymen, in Berkshire. The contrast, in point of morality, between this hero, and the crowd of judges, bishops, and ministers of state, who fill up the back-ground of the picture, is most favourable to him; and in the end he escapes scot-free to America, where he becomes a pattern of wisdom and beneficence to the whole occidental republic. A third, a fourth, and a fifth of these novels are occupied in the delineation of different varieties of the attractive murderer. In ‘Devereux,’ a gentleman, outside all amiable, murders his brother's wife, and ends his days as an interesting religious enthusiast in Italy. ‘Eugene Aram’ (one of the real heroes in the Newgate Calendar) is held up to sympathy and admiration as a pure-minded intellectualist, habitually noble in action, feeling, and thought. In ‘The Disowned,’ an eminent philanthropist and great political reformer murders his chief benefactor by mistake, supposing him to be the premier. We do not mean that Sir E. L. Bulwer *condemns* these actions of his heroes; he does no

more, of course, than praise them with 'faint blame,' and leaves his readers to conclude, that into mistakes such as these strong delusion or an overpowering moral necessity is exceedingly apt to betray the best of men.

"We do not know what were the services for which Sir E. L. Bulwer was made a baronet, unless it was for writing these novels. The fact that such writing should be a path to political influence and social distinction, is not the least among the symptoms of that evil which we wish to expose. Nor can it surprise any one that, after such an example, a host of imitators should have started up, who have carried the matter somewhat further."

Mr. Ainsworth next, and most righteously, comes in for a share of the writer's condemnation:—

"Mr. Ainsworth, in particular, has done his best to convince all aspiring spirits among the rising generations of Saffron-hill and Ratcliffe-highway, who would fain 'seek the bubble reputation, even at the cannon's mouth,' that a death upon the gallows, after an adventurous warfare against society, is the most glorious, as well as the shortest, road to a romantic immortality. Dick Turpin and Jack Sheppard have become heroes, and Guy Fawkes is now canonized as a saint.

"The drama also has been infected. And here we must again reprobate the connivance of the late Whig Ministry at the dissemination of these vicious principles. Under license of the Lord Chamberlain, a play, founded on the story of 'Jack Sheppard,' was acted for many nights, to overflowing houses, at the Adelphi; and the apprentices of London, upon the principle that

'Segnius irritant animos demissa per aurem
Quam quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus,'

were invited to see the exploits of the gay highwayman realized before their eyes, amid the acclamations of a brilliant and evidently sympathizing audience. Later still, the story of 'Madame Laffarge' has been represented, with due sentimentality, upon the London boards."

Not less do we agree with the remarks which follow. The fact is, that all these errors—if errors be not too lenient a name for them—arise from the false standard of thinking, which we owe partly to France and partly to our "*light literature*."

"The conduct of coroners' juries, in returning verdicts of insanity in almost every case of suicide, operates in the same mischievous direction; suggesting compassion and sympathy as the only feelings proper to be excited by a large class of criminal acts, which society ought rather to repress and discourage by all means in its power. Those verdicts cannot be sustained except upon theory, that every crime committed against a man's true interest is madness, and the subject of pity rather than censure."

Most true is this: that all such persons—Mr. Ainsworth as

well as his heroes—are morally and intellectually insane, we have no wish to deny; but we detest, as pure cant (the most despicable of all things), the *philosophy* which would excuse a culprit on *such* grounds.

“Another phasis of the same mischief is the vicious curiosity and morbid interest which some persons in the upper ranks of society are accustomed to manifest concerning those who, from time to time, are convicted of remarkable crimes. It is for no good purpose that the newspapers teem with details about everything which such criminals say or do; that complete biographies of them are presented to the public; that report after report expatiates upon every refinement and peculiarity in their wickedness; that religious ladies circulate histories of their edifying ends; that their likenesses are set up in the print-shops, and their wax figures installed among emperors and statesmen in Madame Tussaud’s bazaar. It is for no good that lords and ladies, and distinguished gentlemen, visit these wretches in Newgate, converse with them, shake hands with them, give great prices for their autographs or locks of their hair. In all this there is no Christian abhorrence of their crime, but rather a disposition to view them as great men after their own fashion—brilliant stars, though moving in an eccentric orbit. The effect of these things was exemplified by the case of Oxford (no maniac, we believe), who avowed that the ambition of this kind of notoriety was his motive for attempting the life of our gracious Queen.”

But we must now give a few parting words to Mr. Ainsworth before we leave the subject, one to which we assure him we have no liking; for we love not dabbling in moral turpitude.

We would remind Mr. Ainsworth of those persons who have earned an immortality of infamy by their publications. One of these was Nicholas Chorier; we will not pollute our pages by naming more. Nicholas Chorier wrote in exquisitely beautiful Latin, and, therefore, his vileness could hurt only the learned, and they may be supposed capable of taking care of themselves. Moreover, he was not so far gone in iniquity but that he had some sense of shame; and he accordingly attributed his abominable production to another. The steps which Mr. Ainsworth has taken would render us not surprised if such works as that to which we have alluded were to appear in our own tongue. The truth is, that, when once the foundations of morality are sapped, we can never be sure where the consequences will stop; and Mr. Ainsworth has removed one stone from the wall which keeps out the flood of vice and crime. Nor is this all; he has encouraged others to the same work; he has shown, that thus to aid in destroying the souls of men is profitable, so far as money is concerned; and he has prostituted his name and his reputation (if, indeed, Jack Sheppard had left him any which it would not be a blessing to lose) by supporting and writing for one of the worst

of Sunday newspapers. Even while we are writing this, we see advertised a new Newgate hero—a fresh apotheosis of crime and vagabondism; and seasoned, too, with anecdotes of great and good men now living. Is it not an insult of the foulest character to the pure-minded and high-principled Wordsworth, that his venerable name should be advertised together with that of *Jack Hatfield*, as the joint attractions of a novel after the fashion of Mr. Ainsworth? That person has committed an offence—a repeated offence against society, which we hope, for his own sake, he will soon publicly acknowledge, and, so far as possible, retract. He cannot undo the mischief he has done; he cannot bring back to habits of order and virtue those who have been seduced, by his vulgar novels, into crime. But he may imitate the example of John Willmott, Earl of Rochester—a far less mischievous offender. He may publish his regret that such works were ever published, and we trust that he will not wait for a death-bed to do so. We cannot help saying, that, though the public taste is depraved, it is such writers as Mr. Ainsworth who have been the causes of its depravation; by writing novels such as they have done they have created a demand for more; and let them remember, that while, by their works, the higher class of readers is disgusted, the lower is demoralized.

And now, to take away the last excuse, viz., that they have imitated Dickens, who, in his “*Oliver Twist*,” rendered his readers but too familiar with the details of crime, we would say, first, that we do not altogether approve of “*Oliver Twist*;” but that, secondly, *their* novels are not imitations of that. Nobody has ever made a pickpocket by the fascinations of the Artful Dodger, or a housebreaker by admiration of Mr. Sykes. Every vicious character is held up by Dickens to our hatred—every vice to our disgust: the only characters we learn to love are virtuous, and every departure from virtue ably shown to be attended by a proportionate visitation of misery. Our objection to “*Oliver Twist*” is, that it is extremely improbable that any youth so educated would have conducted himself as does Mr. Dickens’s hero; human nature is too frail to allow us to make such a supposition: and as it would not be safe to make the experiment, so there is some danger lest such a book, so captivating by its many beauties, should lead the reader to deem either that human nature is better than it really is, or to overlook the *absolute necessity* of a religious education.

But in the case of Mr. Ainsworth and his compeers (“*Eugene Aram*” is as bad in principle as “*Jack Sheppard*”) we have a convicted criminal decked out with all manner of imaginary virtues—all the *splendida vitia* which most attract the unwary;

we have all the coarseness and vulgarity reserved for the officers of the law, against whom a species of prejudice is raised; and, finally, when the hero is hanged, we have a flourish of trumpets, and something like an attempt to remove the ignominy of the punishment.

We shall close our remarks on the morality of the modern novel by deliberately recording our judgment, that Mr. Ainsworth is a greater delinquent than Mr. Owen; for the one we look upon to have spread the poison of his opinions through some mad notions of philanthropy; the other, for "the love of filthy lucre."

ART. III.—*The Fine Arts in England, and their Prospects, considered relative to National Education.* BY EDWARD EDWARDS. London: Saunders and Otley. 1840.

2. *The Origin, Progress, and Present Condition of the Fine Arts in Great Britain and Ireland.* 2 vols. London: Whittaker. 1841.

3. *A Commission to Enquire into the Present Condition of the Fine Arts in Great Britain, and the Means of Improving them.* 1841.

GOVERNMENT have recently issued a commission to a number of noblemen and gentlemen in the country, of the greatest taste and distinction, to enquire into the means of promoting the cultivation and improvement of the Fine Arts in Great Britain. This step is not only important from the consequences to which it may lead, but much more from the consciousness which it implies. It necessarily presupposes a sense of inferiority—an admission of the existence of circumstances which have hitherto impeded the progress of Art; it is an admission, in fact, that the Fine Arts, as hitherto practised amongst us, have not reached the eminence which our wealth, our greatness, and immortal celebrity in the other walks of genius, might have entitled the nation to expect. If the consciousness of inferiority is the first step to amendment, this is a very great step indeed in the history of Art amongst us; and if it is only followed by a similar and corresponding sense of inferiority and desire for improvement on the part of the other classes of society, it may ultimately be the means of raising this country to a distinction in the arts of imitation commensurate to that which it has long enjoyed in poetry, philosophy, and the mechanical arts.

To any one who considers the astonishing greatness to which these islands have arrived in literature, and all the branches of human intellect, it must appear self-evident that the attainments hitherto made in the Fine Arts have been altogether incommensurate to their eminence in every other respect. It is no doubt true, that the history of this country can boast of the names of some great artists, such as Reynolds, Richard Wilson, Lawrence, Flaxman, Turner, and Chantrey; and that a host of artists of inferior celebrity, but still considerable talent, are to be met with, especially in landscape and portrait painting. It is also true, that the school of painting which now exists among us is decidedly superior to any that is *now* in existence in Italy, and may well bear a comparison with all that the most accomplished artists are at present able to produce, either at Paris, Munich, or St. Petersburg. But all that is very little to the purpose. Italy is now in a state of political decline; her genius is worn out by long established civilization, and cramped by external despotism; she is in the condition of Greece during the ten centuries it dragged out an ignoble existence under the government of Rome; or of the Byzantine empire, which for a thousand years, amidst incessant direction of public attention to the arts of peace and the embellishments of social life, did not produce a single work of art worthy of being handed down to future times. The talent of France, in consequence of the revolution and the military career of Napoleon, was forcibly turned into the arts of war; and the almost entire destruction of all the great fortunes in that country, by the convulsion of 1789, has taken away all encouragement from the higher branches of art, except that which can be afforded from the municipalities and the government. The other monarchies of Europe, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, have had their energies hitherto so exclusively directed to military pursuits, and have been so fettered in the higher branches of thought or conception by the absolute nature of their governments, that it is in vain to expect in them the highest efforts either of literature or art. But since the Restoration has given, at least, external peace to France, the Fine Arts at Paris have taken a surprising start, and the English artists would do well to look to their laurels, if they do not mean to be distanced in the race, even of modern art, by their brethren on the other side of the channel. Let those who doubt this look at the picture of Napoleon riding over the field of battle at Eylau, by Legros.

The true test of comparison to apply to English art at this time is, to compare it with that which obtained at Greece in the age of Pericles, in Rome under the first emperors, in Italy in

the time of Raphael and Michael Angelo, in Spain in that of the Emperor Charles V., and in the Netherlands in the time of Rubens and Vandyke. We have now reached the highest point of our national prosperity and glory; the strife of arms has ceased; unparalleled military and naval triumphs have been achieved; and genius in every other department has risen almost to the very summit, even of ideal perfection. Shakspeare, after a long strife of two hundred and fifty years, is, by universal consent, now placed at the head of dramatic poets; the sublimity of Milton is unparalleled in ancient or modern times; the names of Bacon and Newton stand unrivalled in the rolls of European fame; Pitt and Fox have carried the art of Parliamentary oratory to its highest perfection; Burke, in the philosophy of politics, is as yet unrivalled; Scott has fascinated the world by the fidelity of romantic painting, and the brilliancy of ideal conception. In all the departments of human genius most nearly allied to the Fine Arts, Great Britain stands at the head of the literature of modern Europe.

Have we then any artists in painting, sculpture, or architecture, who are to be placed abreast of these great men in the Fine Arts? Have we a portrait painter whose works would bear a comparison, after the interest of the likeness is over, with the breathing canvass of Titian or Vandyke? Can we exhibit an historical painter whose compositions will stand the test of ages, like those of Michael Angelo, Raphael, or Caracci? Has a British Phidias or Praxetiles yet arisen amongst us, whose works are destined, after the lapse of two thousand years, to form the delight and admiration of mankind? Has a British Berghem or Cuyp appeared to perpetuate the sweetness of our pastoral scenes? Has a British Claude arisen, to hand down to future ages the soft richness of our southern scenery, or a British Salvator to immortalize the grandeur of our highland mountains? Has a Murillo grown up amongst us, to perpetuate, with graphic fidelity, the expressive and varied features of our peasantry; or a Velasquez, to hand down to distant ages the features of our nobles, or the beauty of our countrywomen? Where is the British Teniers, whose works, after the lapse of three hundred years, will be studied as models of composition, colouring, and shade, as applied to humble life; or the Rembrandt, the magic of whose pencil is to light up with the colours of enchantment even the commonest scenes of ordinary life? Alas! we have no rivals to these great men to produce, even in this age of transcendant exertion and talent. Great as was the genius, noble the conceptions of Sir Joshua Reynolds, even his best pictures will bear no sort of comparison, either in composition, shade, or

colouring, with those of the masters in the Spanish and Italian schools: the best portraits of Lawrence appear little better than splendid shadows, compared to the immortal and finished productions of Velasquez and Vandyke: Turner and Wilson had, each in their separate walk, great conceptions of landscape painting, but their execution has in no degree corresponded to the vigour of their conceptions: and however admirable may have been the design, and faithful the execution of Wilkie's pictures, their want of shade and breadth of effect must for ever prevent them from taking their place beside those of the great masters of the Dutch or Flemish schools.

Turn to architecture: the same obvious and painful inferiority of British to foreign art, at least in modern times, is conspicuous. To a traveller, who returns home with his mind full of the *noble* remains of Roman or Grecian genius in this *noble* art, it is beyond measure painful to witness the wretched ephemeral productions of brick and stucco, which, like mushrooms, have risen up in every great city of the empire. Nay, the modern edifices of St. Petersburg, Paris, and Munich, throw the modern erections of London into the shade, if we except the magnificent bridges over the Thames, which are truly unique, and alone worthy of the modern greatness of England. The insane passion for variety of forms—the desire to strike out something new—which had so long and so sorely been felt in the modern architecture of Rome and Florence three hundred years ago, has now seized, with undiminished intensity, upon our architects, and produced a mass of ephemeral splendour or varied deformity which may safely be pronounced to be unparalleled in the history of the world. Regent-street, and the Regent's-park, and some of the new terraces round Hyde-park, indeed, exhibit, upon the whole, a splendid array of pillared scenery; but a small part only of the gorgeous assemblage will bear a critical examination, and the whole is composed of such perishable materials, that in half a century it will be entirely swept away. With the exception always of the bridges in London, few architectural monuments worthy of the name have been raised in Britain for the last hundred years. Where is our pillar in the *Placé Vendôme*, or our Pantheon, or church of the *Madeleine*, to rival the recent and beautiful edifices which adorn the city of Paris? Where our church of St. Isaac, or granite column of Alexander, or colonnade of the church of Cazan, or façade of the Admiralty, or granite quays, to emulate the recent structures of St. Petersburg? What have we to show even comparable to the manly simplicity of the Brandenburg-gate, or the adjoining architectural scenery of

Berlin? Or to the peristyle of the hall of Valhalla, or the beautiful scenery of the Glyptothek, or Palace of the Arts, at Munich? Why all we can show are the pepper-boxes at each extremity of Trafalgar-square, and the Duke of York's pillar in Waterloo-place. Truly we have produced works worthy of the age of Nelson and Wellington, and of the greatness of an empire which encircles the earth!

As this point of the inferiority of British art, both in the present age and for some centuries back, to that which has arisen at distant times in the brightest eras of continental genius, is at once the fundamental point of our argument, and, at the same time, the position which will probably be most disputed, and certainly create the most dissatisfaction amongst our artists, it seems material to attend to one consideration, which is decisive on the subject. Whatever may be the rivalry or jealousies of nations or individuals, during their struggles for pre-eminence, posterity invariably renders justice to the dead. By the common consent of mankind, Grecian sculpture and Italian painting are placed at the head of their respective arts. The colonnade of St. Peter's, the music of Handel, the taste of Mozart, the genius of Napoleon, are immortal throughout the globe. Even to living artists, by the common consent of mankind, pre-eminence is conceded where it is justly due: Scott and Byron, in England; Canova and Thorswalden, at Rome; Chateaubriand and Lamartine, at Paris; Göethe and Schiller, in Germany; all acquired an European reputation during their own lifetime. How, then, has it happened that a similar universal fame has not, by the common consent of mankind, been conceded to any, even the greatest of British artists? Why are not the portraits of Reynolds and Lawrence prized as much, in the galleries of St. Petersburg and Vienna, as the master-pieces of Titian and Vandyke? Why are not the landscapes of Turner and Richard Wilson placed alongside of those, at Rome, of Claude and Salvator? Why do the youth of our country, and all our artists who can afford it, flock to Italy, to inhale, amidst the great works of former times, the true spirit of art in its highest branches? Why, if we are equal to the foreigners in the Fine Arts, as our artists perpetually tell us they are, do not foreigners resort to this country to form their taste upon the models of British genius, as they do to study our railways, our viaducts, our manufactures, our bridges, our dock-yards, and our naval establishments? Why are not engravings of our master-pieces, in figure or landscape painting, to be seen in every printseller's shop in the continental towns in the same manner as engravings of every great work of foreign art are to be seen in every print-

shop in this country, or as translations of our great poets and historians are to be found in every bookseller's shop from St. Petersburg to Gibraltar? Rely upon it, mankind, at least in the case of departed genius, never fail to do justice to the highest class of excellence, wherever it is to be found.

The wretched turn and diminutive stature, both of the national taste and architectural genius, of late years, are the more remarkable when we consider the stupendous and colossal monuments of genius which actually exist among us in this department. Look at our ancient cathedrals, erected during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, when Great Britain did not contain an eighth part of its present inhabitants, and certainly not an eightieth part of its present wealth. How lofty and magnificent is the conception of these noble edifices!—how colossal their proportions!—how graceful and delicate their details! How elevated must have been the feelings of a nation, which, in an age of comparative poverty and barbarism, when general education was unknown, and general comfort unfelt—when our nobles were living in chambers strewn with rushes, and our peasants sleeping with a round log for a pillow—could yet conceive and execute such stupendous undertakings! Admitting that it was a race of foreign artists, the Italian free-masons, who in part conceived and executed these sublime edifices, still we can never sufficiently admire the grandeur of desire, the solemn feeling of duty, the heroic perseverance in purpose, which could lead our ancestors, during seven or eight successive generations, to toil in the construction of these edifices, some of which took above two hundred years for their completion, and none of which brought in one farthing of profit, either to their authors or their descendants.

Descend to later times, and we will still find the architectural genius of Britain keeping pace with its great and growing destinies. Charles I., whose taste in every branch of the Fine Arts was of the most exquisite nature, was only prevented by the disastrous civil wars, which terminated in his death, from constructing a palace worthy of the kings of England, and which, if we may judge from the fragment of it that alone was completed at Whitehall, would have rivalled the palace of St. Mark at Venice, or the palace of Versailles at Paris. The dome of St. Paul's still remains an eternal monument of the taste and genius of Sir Christopher Wren, and towers above the diminutive structures of later times, like a hoary giant who has survived his race, and fallen into an age of pigmies. Even the heavy but imposing architecture of Vanburgh still partook, though in a diminished degree, of the grand conceptions of former times; and, strange

to say, our architectural genius declined in proportion as the nation grew in stature, and we became dwarfs in building when we had become giants in national strength and greatness.

It has been customary, of late years, to hold up our sculpture as a branch of art in which we have really attained pre-eminence; and it may be admitted, that here there is less reason for the reflecting observer to feel mortification at the station which his country has assumed at its highest eminence in this, than the other branches of the Fine Arts. The exalted conceptions and varied imagination of Flaxman—the exquisite pathos and high moral feeling in the sepulchral pieces of Chantrey—more lately, the classical conceptions and rising genius of Gibson—have done much to keep Great Britain abreast in this one art of her high calling in literature and philosophy. But still these artists, great as they are, are not what we have a right to expect from the genius of England. It is much to be feared that none of them have acquired an European, far less an immortal, reputation. Will the works of any of them bear a comparison, two thousand years hence, with the works of Phidias or Praxetiles—with the fighting gladiator or the Venus de Medicis? Yet that is the only question which, in a national point of view, is worth considering;—this, and this only, is the competition which our sculptors should buckle themselves up to sustain.

It is to be recollected that we are now precisely at the period of national progress when the greatest and most exalted efforts in every branch of art are to be expected. We have arrived at that period in our national history when the talent and energy of the nation, long and successfully turned to military and political elevation, has brought the national fortunes to the very highest point of exaltation, and when the warmest friend to his country could scarcely wish for its farther extension, lest he should accelerate the period of its fall. This is precisely the period which, in all other nations, has been that of the highest and most exalted efforts of art. It corresponds to the period of Pericles in Grecian, of Augustus in Roman, of Leo X. in Italian story. It may be paralleled to the age of Charles V. in Spanish, or of Louis XIV. in modern French history. We have reached the point of national efflorescence; if we do not flower now, we shall never flower. This is the pressing consideration which strikes us with such melancholy in surveying the present state of the arts in Great Britain. This it is which should ever be present to the minds of our statesmen, and our artists, who reflect on this subject. Short-lived and evanescent indeed is the period of transcendant greatness allotted, by the laws of Providence, to any nation, either in arts or in arms. Almost all the

great men of every nation have grown up together. The period of the highest excellence in literature and philosophy has invariably been that of the greatest achievements in the Fine Arts. Phidias was a contemporary of Euripides, Plato, and Thucydides; Raphael, Michael Angelo, and Leonardo de Vinci, were contemporaries of Tasso and Ariosto. The dome of St. Paul's was erected in the lifetime of Newton. Long, melancholy, and perpetually declining, is the period of the decay of nations. If our artists once get themselves engulfed in that fatal stream, they will speedily be swallowed up in the ocean of self-interest, temporary fortune, and permanent ignominy. There are no great things to be done, except, perhaps, by a single genius which stands forth alone, amidst its compeers, in an age of declining national strength and increasing national riches. Now is the moment when the great spirit of former times is still alive, and the wealth it produced is to be found amongst us in boundless and unparalleled profusion. Now or never!

The artists of the present day, and their numerous supporters in the public press, will loudly exclaim against these remarks, as overcharged; and boldly maintain, for the existing artists of Great Britain, an equality, not merely with those on the continent in the present times, but with the illustrious dead in former ages. We devoutly wish that this plea were well founded, and that all that has been stated on the opposite side were as unfounded as it is painful.

We fear, however, that in the very fact of the loud claim set by our modern artists to superiority, is to be found sufficient evidence of a secret sense of inferiority. Real greatness is ever careless of what is thought of it; it is a secret consciousness of inferiority which requires the constant stimulus of laudatory expression, or is consumed by the jealousy of external greatness. Shakspeare was so indifferent to his reputation, that it was by mere chance his tragedies were preserved. We never hear of Hume or Gibbon having expressed the slightest jealousy of Rousseau or Voltaire. The excessive and unbounded jealousy uniformly displayed by the whole artists of Great Britain, whenever a foreign artist is brought into competition for the execution of any great work of art in this country, affords decisive evidence that they are so far from being well assured, at bottom, of the superiority which they claim, as their language might lead us to suppose. When the British artists can bear to be brought into daily competition with those of foreign countries, and can see, without pain, their competitors preferred, when they themselves have been distanced in the race, they may be satisfied that they are on a level with them, but not till then.

The plea in justification for the British artists usually advanced, by those who have candour enough to admit their inferiority to those of former times in other countries, is, that they do not meet with the same encouragement which is there held out to the exertion of genius in the Fine Arts; and that, till this is the case, it is in vain to expect that the national genius will take this direction. We cannot admit the justice of this observation—at least, in its full extent. We are well aware, indeed, of the difficulties with which young talent has frequently to struggle in the Fine Arts, and of the cold chill which is too often thrown over infant genius, by the neglect or indifference of the public: but that is the common fate of genius in every line: but yet it has had no effect in preventing poverty from reaching the very highest pinnacle of intellectual greatness in other departments. Milton made his bread as a schoolmaster, and meanwhile wrote his “Paradise Lost,” which he sold for 5*l*. Shakspeare, while earning his livelihood as a strolling player, wrote the tragedies which will for ever entrance the world. Newton made nothing by the publication of the “Principia.” Johnson, in a garret in Fleet-street, wrote the works which have given such colossal proportions to his reputation. Burns, at the plough, composed the poems which stand at the head of lyrical poetry in modern times. Campbell, at the age of seventeen, wrote the “Pleasures of Hope” in lodgings, when he hardly knew where to turn for bread. Genius must live, indeed, as well as other mortals; but its highest inspirations descend from heaven without any taint of earthly interest, and, like sleep, in Shakspeare’s simile, it will come to the sailor boy when resting on the shrouds, when it is denied to a king reposing on his down.

To successful genius in the Fine Arts, rewards, both of a greater and more flattering kind, are held out in this country, than stimulate the exertions either of science, literature, or philosophy. For above a century past two or three of the leading portrait painters in London have been making from three to five thousand pounds a year each. Some, such as Reynolds, Lawrence, and Beechey, realized a much larger sum. Flaxman left a great fortune. Chantrey died worth ninety thousand pounds, and for many years before his death had been in the receipt of a professional income of from twelve to twenty thousand pounds a year. Even in the subordinate capitals of Dublin and Edinburgh the most eminent artists realize a handsome income. Raeburn, in the latter city, made three thousand pounds a year for nearly twenty years. There are no rewards at all approaching to this which are within the reach either of the poet, the orator, the historian, or the philosopher. Yet how transcendant has been the talent

displayed in these departments compared to that which has taken the direction of art. Nor is this all. Honours and distinctions of a still more captivating kind, to a sensitive mind, await the successful artist, to which the highest class of literary labourers must ever remain strangers. Their avocation brings them into close contact and familiar intercourse with the great, the affluent, the cultivated, and the beautiful. Rank, fashion, and distinction wait at their threshold, anxiously seeking for a moment of admission. The drawing-rooms of the great are thrown open to them—they become the honoured guests of rank, power, and even royalty itself; and the powerful influence of such auxiliaries speedily appears in the titles and honours which are showered down upon their heads. For one title of honour bestowed upon a philosopher, or literary man, there are ten bestowed, and worthily so, upon the celebrity of arts. The reason of this is obvious. The career of the artist brings him at once into personal contact with the great and powerful; the labours of the highest class of literary or philosophical men lead them, apart from such fascinating circles, into the cool shade of meditation and retirement. The one amuses and interests—the other instructs and chastises mankind. Hence the one obtains immediate celebrity, distinction, and honour; while for the other is reserved the (to most men) comparatively feeble excitement of posthumous greatness and distinction.

If there is great and deserved encouragement for modern artists in the purchase of new works of art, much more is it evident that the habits and tastes of the higher class of people in this country are such as are fitted to afford a permanent guarantee for the encouragement and protection of the works of native genius. The sums annually expended in the purchase of the great masters of the foreign schools, or in the remains of ancient statuary, in this country, are prodigious, and probably greater than ever were directed to these objects by any single state since the beginning of the world. It is no exaggeration to say, that some hundred thousand pounds are annually spent in this way. The treasures of art, in consequence, which are now accumulated, not merely in the metropolis, but in all the principal mansions of the nobility and gentry in every part of the country, are prodigious; and such, if brought together and exposed to public view, would produce richer galleries than any that are to be met with in the continental cities. This strong and growing predilection for works of art, on the part of a considerable portion of the wealthier classes of society, affords decisive evidence that a similar taste would speedily be as generally diffused for the works of modern art, if they were of equal

merit. In literature, we are never mistaken on this subject. No one supposes that, because our young men are early initiated in the study of the classics, they will, therefore, be insensible to the beauties of the poets or historians of their own country. No one imagines that, because they buy Virgil and Homer, they will not purchase Milton or Scott. On the contrary, it is universally known and experienced, that the more the mind is opened by a just appreciation of the beauty of the great writers of antiquity, the more is it rendered alive to the beauty of the literature of modern times. It is the first communication of the *taste* for literature at all that is the great matter. If *that* is once achieved, the transition for the partiality of domestic genius follows as a matter of course. There are none make such extensive purchases of English books as those who have begun the formation of their library with a collection of the best classical authors, and of the great modern writers of continental Europe.

There must be something, therefore, independent of the causes which are usually assigned and put forward by our artists, to account for our evident inferiority in all the branches of our Fine Arts; not so much to our present neighbours on the continent, who are either in a state of political decline, or want those advantages of freedom and general intelligence which we possess, as to the great lights of former times, with whom alone it should be the object of the genius of Great Britain, at this time, to enter into competition. What these causes are it is an object of the highest importance to enquire; for the progress of art is, in every sense, a national concern—as much as the efflorescence of a plant, it is part of the natural growth at a certain stage of a nation; and if the national wealth and genius is not directed at the fitting season to these objects, which elevate and refine the soul, it will inevitably take that course which debases and degenerates it. We know not, therefore, that we can better employ the attention of our readers for a short time than in investigating at once the causes which have led to our present deficiencies, and the means by which it is possible they may be removed.

Foreigners have a short and easy method of disposing of this generally felt and acknowledged mediocrity of British art, when compared with the great works of foreign and past nations. They say the *climate* of the British islands is inconsistent with the highest flights of genius; that our fogs and cloudy skies deaden the imagination, and render men inaccessible to those delicate feelings, that enthusiastic ardour, which are ripened under the brilliant sun of Italy and Greece. Fully conceding the influence of climate and physical circumstances on national cha-

racter—an influence incomparably more real and extensive than is generally either felt or acknowledged in these days—we yet cannot admit the validity of this reason as applied to the fine arts—facts demonstrate the reverse. The genius and taste which make a great poet, orator, historian, or romance writer, are essentially the same as those which create the highest painters, sculptors, and architects; for the one class paint by writing to the imagination—the other, by external images to the eye. But where shall we find so great a host of graphic painters as in the British authors? What shall we say to the splendid historical portraits of Gibbon, which all but bring the breathing host of the Crusaders, the Saracens, and the Tartars before our eyes? What of the mighty wand of Scott, which summons up in magic array the dead, the absent, the illustrious, of every former age, and brings the endless phantasmagoria, in living colours, to our sight? What of the splendid pencil of Byron, dipped in its own hues of orient brightness? What of the master touches of Shakspeare, revealing the soul of Michael Angelo, even in the images painted in a single line?

Even in the imitative arts themselves the force and originality of British talent have more than once been rendered apparent. Who ever surpassed Sir Joshua Reynolds in the power, grace, and originality of his conceptions? If he had been thrown in a country capable of appreciating his genius, and where it was directed to the highest instead of a subordinate and almost mechanical branch of his art, he would have rivalled in execution, as he already has in design, the greatest works of Spanish or Italian genius. The sublime and awful grandeur of many of Martin's conceptions belong to the very highest department of art; his paintings really seem calculated, as he himself intended, to awaken a nation to a sense of their dangers when revelling before the flood. Turner's imagination, before it ran into the extravagance of fantastic colouring, was sometimes equal to, and always more varied than, that of Claude; if he had flourished in a country which *compelled* him to rise to the greatness which he was qualified to attain, by chastening his taste and curbing his eccentricities, he would have attained the first rank in landscape painting. Vandyke, a Fleming by birth, and subject to the influence of as moist and gloomy an atmosphere as any British artist, laboured at his easel for fifteen years in London, under the auspices of Charles I., and he rivalled Titian himself in the richness of his colouring and the delicacy of his finishing. Rubens, whose powerful genius has immortalized itself in some works of surpassing grandeur; Rembrandt, whose magic pencil has given an inexpressible charm even to the rude and coarse

imagery of the Dutch provinces; Ruysdael, who has with graphic force delineated the forests and wilder scenes of Flanders and Germany; Hobbema, whose oaks will be as perennial as their hoary prototypes in the Ardennes forest; Teniers, the delicacy of whose pencil has given grace even to the homely scenes of Flemish life; Ostade, who has extracted beauty even out of the Dutch boors—were all bred under as dark skies and cloudy heavens as Great Britain. Why have not the great manufacturing cities of Manchester, Liverpool, or Glasgow, each their Rubens and Vandyke to boast of, as their less opulent and powerful predecessor on the banks of the Scheldt?

“The reason is obvious (said Canova to the writer of this paper) why England cannot boast of artists commensurate to its greatness in other respects: if England were Italy, Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox would have been painters; and then Italy would have had very little reason to boast its superiority.” There is probably more in this reason than the frequency of our rains or the gloom of our skies; yet, admitting that the natural tendency of free institutions and a popular form of government is to attract genius of the highest character to the senate house, the bar, or periodical literature, facts combine with theory in demonstrating that it is not by such abstraction that any branch of human exertion is ever starved down to mediocrity. In the countless multitudes of mankind, in every age, genius adequate to the greatest exertions, in every line, lies dormant; the exciting cause is the real desideratum. If we look back to other times, and to none more than the Augustan age of modern Italy itself, we shall see that the era in which talent achieved its greatest triumphs in one department is always that in which it was equally signalized in another; that poetry, oratory, painting, sculpture, architecture, history, philosophy, all advanced *abreast*, and each caught an additional portion of the sacred fire from that which its rivals had kindled; that they all rose to supreme eminence together, and all began to decline at the same time. No one ever imagined that the drama was starved in Greece because Sophocles and Euripides were contemporary with Phidias, Thucydides, Pericles, and Plato; or that painting was kept in mediocrity in Italy because the age of Raphael, Leonardo da Vinci, and Michael Angelo was the same with that of Tasso, Ariosto, Galileo, and Bramante. Scott was contemporary with Pitt and Fox; Byron with Wellington and Canning; and the same table, at the Literary Club, often beheld together Johnson, Reynolds, Gibbon, and Goldsmith.

The causes, therefore, which are usually assigned for the undeniable inferiority of all the departments of British art to the

that and departed rivals on the continent, are obviously insufficient to account for the phenomena which they profess to explain; for if they had been really of adequate power to repress the human mind in this branch, they must equally have repressed in many others in which we have attained to universally admitted pre-eminence.

As little is our state of inferiority in the Fine Arts to be ascribed to any want of *original* talent in the men who devote their energies to these studies. If we examine their works, indeed, after they have laboured five-and-twenty years at the pencil or the easel, we may well be astonished, in the general view, at the mediocrity of their attainments; but, as young men, they often give promise of as high genius as any of the late masters of other climes or former days; and nothing strikes an observer, who watches the course of their progress, so much as

disproportion which is painfully manifest between their earlier efforts and the productions of their maturer years. *They get to a certain point, but they never get beyond it.* At

every time when they should be pressing on to the highest honours of their noble career they suddenly stop short, satisfied with what they have already achieved, and careless of any reputation beyond that which they have already acquired. Few,

indeed, among them appear animated by a longing after immortality. Many, disgusted with what they deem the coldness and insensibility of the world to their transcendent merits, retire from their profession, and are never more heard of. Others are swallowed up in the bottomless gulph of portrait painting, and spend their lives in the mechanical imitation of ugly men and old women.

A few rise to the highest rewards which this country can afford to art; are flattered by rank and caressed by fashion; to be found at the tables of the great and the boudoirs of the beautiful; obtain the honours of the Crown and the applause of the nation; and meanwhile sink down into commonness and mediocrity.

Few, if any, amongst us, even of those whose genius was at first most distinctly pronounced, ever keep pace with their early promise, or equal in their maturer the conceptions of their earliest years. Lawrence's portraits, now that we look upon them in retrospect, appear to decline in merit as he advanced in riches and celebrity; Chantrey's fame will finally rest upon the exquisite pathos of the sleeping children in Lichfield cathedral, and his first monumental pieces; the talent of Wilkie never equalled the productions of the first years of his London fame; and, if we would retain our lofty conception of the genius of Turner, we must shut our eyes to the whole productions of the later years of his life.

What is it, then, which thus benumbs and paralyzes our native genius in the Fine Arts in an age when they meet with such general encouragement, and which is distinguished by such transcendent greatness in every other department of intellect and thought? The causes are to be found in a variety of circumstances, which do not repel genius from these alluring pursuits, but *turn it into a profitable but comparatively degrading path*, and the total absence either of encouragement for, or appreciation of, those *higher branches* of the Arts in which alone vent can be found for the most elevated aspirations of the human soul.

The first of these causes is to be found in the nature of our reformed faith, which, for three centuries, has entirely turned aside the genius of our artists from all subjects calculated to awaken religious emotion.

Of us in this review it will not readily be feared that any disposition exists to underrate the incalculable blessings which the Protestant Reformation has bestowed upon the world, or the slightest wish to revert to those hideous devices by which the Romish Church so entirely perverted the pure spirit of Christianity, that in the fifteenth century it was said there was "hardly one Christian to be found in all Christendom." But with the strongest possible sense of the enormous evils which the Romish Church, by the worship of images and the practical engrafting of idolatrous error on Christian purity, has entailed upon the world, it cannot be disputed that the direction of so large a portion of the pictorial genius of all Roman Catholic states to the production of paintings or statues, for churches or religious establishments, had a most powerful and salutary effect on the direction of art. It turned the attention of artists to the highest branch of their calling, the representation of expression—and that, too, expression of the noblest and most elevated kind—domestic affection, or religious emotion. The artists of continental Europe, being continually employed in the delineation or conception of great altar-pieces, or paintings for refectories in monasteries, where religious subjects could alone be admitted, were led, of necessity, to study art in its highest department; and, when directed to its most elevated objects, the mysteries of Chiaro-oscuro; the proper distribution of light and shade, so as to bring out one uniform and harmonious effect from a great variety of figures; the art of colouring, and blending, and contrasting tints, so as to produce at once the most striking and the most agreeable impression on the eye of the spectator; the perspective of distant figures and objects; the variety of costume, feature, and character, in the different ages, nations, and races of men; above

all, the art of bringing out one emotion and producing one impression on the mind of the beholder from a great variety of separate figures and objects—were all at once called into action in these great productions. To effect these objects with success must be admitted by all to draw forth and require the highest powers of art; and when these powers are directed to the bringing out of a great and elevated expression, whether of pity, terror, sublimity, domestic affection, heroic constancy, or maternal love, it is evident that painting is directed to its highest and most exalted objects.

The zeal of our early Reformers, and the subsequent habits of our Church amongst us, having altogether shut out British art from these elevated objects, the talent of our artists has been turned away from the noblest employment of their pencil, into other, and, comparatively speaking, mechanical branches of their profession. While painters in the Roman Catholic countries have been vying with each other for the production of paintings calculated to awaken the most profound emotions of the human heart—love, pity, admiration, horror, piety, charity, affection, beneficence—the artists of this country have been of necessity chained to the comparatively humble department of portrait painting. While the pencils of the Italian, Flemish, and Spanish schools have been exercised in the representation of Holy Families and Crucifixions, of scenes from our Saviour's life, or the martyrdom of his apostles, of legends of saints, or exploits of heroes, the British school have been exclusively occupied in painting middle-aged, wealthy, and corpulent men, or respectable ugly old women. What if occasionally the dignity of a hero, or the grace of beauty, flitted before their pencil; such angel visits, few and far between, could never compensate the mediocrity communicated to their pencil and ideas by the woful monotony of their every-day subjects. If, instead of following this humble but lucrative pursuit, a young artist endeavoured to elevate his pencil to something greater, he soon found himself neglected, starving, and forlorn, and his divine aspirations cooled down by the chillness of the garret.

It is no answer to these observations to say that some of the greatest painters that ever existed have been portrait painters, and that the master-pieces of this description of Vandyke, Titian, and Velasquez, may be placed beside the finest historical or scriptural pieces that ever were executed, both in point of design and finishing. There can be no doubt that this is the case; but how was it that these great artists acquired the vivid eye and the practised hand requisite to bring this mechanical branch of the art to such perfection? Simply by having their

taste formed and their genius drawn forth by the simultaneous composition of historical and Scripture pieces. Those of Titian are known to all the world; those of Vandyke, though not so common, are equally remarkable; and no one can have visited the rich gallery of Cardinal Fesch, at Rome, without being struck with astonishment at the talent of this great artist in religious compositions. And even in regard to those portrait painters who did little or nothing in original composition, the effect was the same; their genius was drawn forth, their taste was formed, their talents were matured, by the perpetual observation of, or emulation with, the great historical and Scripture master-pieces with which they were surrounded; and they all felt that they had no chance of success, even in their own humble line, unless they communicated to their pieces a portion of the elevated spirit by which the works in the higher branches of art with which they were surrounded were animated.

More than all, the perpetual exhibition of these great works of art, combining the highest powers, and directed to the noblest objects, in the churches, to the habitual gaze of the people, produced that taste for, and appreciation of, the loftier excellencies of art, without which it is in vain to expect that artists are either to aspire to, or attain the highest eminence. Every person must have observed, that if you only exhibit a certain number of the works of art before the eyes even of the most ordinary observer, in the course of travelling, he will insensibly acquire, not only a liking and taste for the Fine Arts, but the power of discriminating the really great productions from inferior ones. Thence the marked difference between the taste even of persons of the most ordinary capacity who have had the benefit of foreign travelling, and those of far superior talent and information who have always remained at home. It is a total mistake to imagine that the great bulk of mankind are not capable, in every country and in every age, of appreciating excellence in every branch of the Fine Arts, if their models are brought before their eyes? We have only to look at Italy, where a taste in music, sculpture, painting, and architecture is more general and more refined among the tradespeople, and even common workmen, than among the higher and most educated classes in the transalpine states, to be convinced that mere humbleness of station and mechanical nature of employment is not inconsistent with the most thorough appreciation of the excellencies, and taste for the enjoyment, of art.

The only durable security, however, for excellence in the Fine Arts, is to be found in the diffusion of an appreciation of its beauties, and a sense of its defects, very generally through the community. Mere taste for, or acquaintance with, the

Arts, in the higher or more opulent classes, is wholly insufficient to produce this effect. A single artist, indeed, may now and then rise to eminence, and even the highest eminence, in a community generally insensible to the merits of art ; but experience proves that no such extraordinary efforts can either be expected for, or reckoned upon, by the isolated efforts of individual genius, unsustained by an appreciation for excellence or a consciousness of demerit in those around it. It is only once in a series of years that a Peter the Great appears among a nation of barbarians.

Generally speaking, genius is wrought up to its highest pitch only by being sustained in its flight by an atmosphere of admiration. It will soon sink to the earth if it is not forcibly retained in the upper regions. If competence can be obtained, and even wealth and distinction procured, by productions of a second class of merit, mankind, in the long run, will never exert themselves to procure the highest. It takes a great deal of thought, and infinitely more trouble, to produce a fine work in one department, than an inferior one ; and if artists find that they can make their bread or gain a fortune by a fortnight's work on a painting, they will never bestow three months. We have heard Raeburn, the Scotch painter, express this in feeling language : " If my lot had been cast in Italy (said he), I would have been obliged to work two months at each picture, and I would have tried to emulate Titian or Caracci ; but as it is here, I can make a hundred guineas in a fortnight by an indifferent full-length portrait ; and if I made it fifty times better than I do, I should lose profit, and not gain fame."

In this circumstance of the extremely limited extent of the circle of persons who are at all qualified to judge of the excellencies, either in painting or sculpture, in any part of the British islands, which is the real cause of the disheartening fact already alluded to, every person who has attended to the subject must have been struck, viz., the number of artists, promising, and evidently gifted with considerable talent in early life, who rise to a certain eminence in their different departments of art, and never get beyond a few hundreds of promising young men of this description appear in every generation in Great Britain, and after executing some really meritorious works, for young men, gradually sink into obscurity as they arrive at maturer years, and are at last scarcely more heard of. The reason is, that they are thrown into a community in which there is at once no general appreciation of the excellencies of art, and yet a steady encouragement for its productions. There is a constant and increasing, as well as a creative, demand for portraits of moderate ability, to gratify the natural vanity, or perpetuate domestic love ; but no quality,

except a faithful delineation of the likeness, is generally required in these productions. If the portrait is only like, that is all that is required. The artist soon finds that, if he bestows great pains upon his work, and makes it a real painting, he loses his time, and neither adds to his fortune nor his reputation. If he attempts to devote his time to the higher branches of historical composition, he finds his picture, after six months' labour, thrown back upon his hands, as no man has either a house to receive, or money to buy it. If he is either a landscape painter, or works in sea pieces or domestic scenes, for which there really is a demand in the country, he soon finds himself surrounded, if he has any ability, with a set of half-instructed flatterers and sycophants, who perpetually sound his praises in his ears, and makes him believe that he has attained excellence when he is only beginning to emerge from mediocrity. For highly-finished productions, the work each of them of three or four months, and which must be charged three or four hundred guineas, he soon finds that there is no sale whatever. For half-finished landscapes, sea pieces, or scenes from humble life, the work of a fortnight each, he readily gets fifty or a hundred guineas a-piece. Thus he is at once flattered into the belief of his excellence, when he has only begun to take the road to it; chilled by neglect and starvation, when he devotes his time to the production of the highest class works of art; and insensibly drawn aside to mediocre performances, by the ready and profitable mart with which they meet. "Interest," as Bulwer has well said, in regard to literary productions, which similar causes are now so much tending to vulgarize and depress, "is continually whispering in the ear of the young aspirant after fame or fortune, not *ASPIRE*, but *DESCEND*."

Whence is it that the Greeks and Italians have derived that universal taste for the Fine Arts, which has impregnated the very atmosphere which they breathe, and given them a durable celebrity in human affairs, beyond what even the industry or the arms of the transalpine nations have been able to acquire? It is the perpetual exhibition of the finest monuments of art to the public gaze, in their churches, in their squares, in their streets, in their forums, in their theatres. Whence is it that travelling so visibly and marvellously improves the taste of all persons, even the least informed or cultivated, who participate in its influence? It is from perpetually gazing on the same objects, which inevitably and insensibly communicate to every mind a clear appreciation of and love for the Fine Arts. If the people of this country had similar advantages, they would rapidly acquire similar tastes. They have all the native instinct for it. We have only to look at the way they surround the window of every print-shop to be convinced that a sense of the

beauty of art is universally implanted in mankind, and that it is *circumstances* only which develope it strongly in one country, and extinguish it in another. What these circumstances are, is the real object of enquiry; if they could be communicated to this country, with its present overgrown opulence and general mental excitement, the growth of a great school of sculpture and painting in the British islands might be reckoned upon as a matter of certainty.

The entire absence of any painting or sculpture devoted to religious subjects in our churches or cathedrals is evidently one principal cause of the low state of the Fine Arts amongst us. Its influence in turning aside the efforts of our artists from the most noble and elevating objects of their art has been already considered; but the influence of the same cause in deadening a perception of the beauties of art among the great mass of the community, and retaining them in an advanced age of civilization, in the lowest station in that respect, is, if possible, still more pernicious. Churches and cathedrals constitute the great point of assemblage in every modern community—they are the forum of the Christian world. No people could ever be insensible to the beauties of art, which had noble paintings and sculpture perpetually placed before their eyes in these places of general and habitual resort. The spiritual feelings which are there awakened, the forgetfulness of self and charitable affections which are incessantly inculcated, the warmth of sentiment which arises under the glow of eloquence or fervour of devotion, are eminently calculated to aid the impression and facilitate the entrance of a taste for the Fine Arts. They pierce that thick coating of selfish interest, and melt that otherwise impervious covering of sensual gratification in which uncultivated men are too often enveloped, and prepare the mind for those more elevated sensations which spring from the exercise of the mental powers and the development of the generous affections. In the varied and multiplied events of the Old and New Testament, extending from the creation of man to the final martyrdom of the last of the apostles, there are to be found, without transgressing the limits of the biblical records, subjects sufficient to exercise the genius of artists, both in the terrible, the sublime, the melting, and the pathetic, to the latest generations of the world.

Next to the total banishment of all these sublime and elevating subjects, from the scruples which, as it appears to us, have been unduly engrafted on the admirable simplicity of the reformed faith, the most important circumstance which has depressed the production by our artists of works in the higher branches of art, and a taste for them throughout the country, has been the total

absence of any demand for historical paintings on the part of our government and municipalities, and the consequent absence of any such works of art in our palaces, courts of justice, public halls, and common thoroughfares. It is, unhappily, superfluous to offer any proof of the total want of any encouragement on the part of all these public bodies. By common consent, and by the apparently unanimous agreement of all classes, this the higher branch of art is left to private encouragement, that is, to no encouragement at all. If any Minister were to propose a grant of 100,000*l.* to the purchase of great works of art, by modern artists, it would speedily raise such a storm of discontent throughout the nation as would probably prove fatal to the Administration. If any body of magistrates were to vote away 500*l.* or 1,000*l.* of the corporate funds for the purchase of any painting or statue, they would probably be deemed mad, and most certainly would never have a chance of being returned again by their democratic constituents. Here and there we see, from the influence of some great family, or some such cause, a full-length portrait of some eminent man placed in a city hall, which participates in the general mediocrity with which it is surrounded; but, with these solitary exceptions, no work of art whatever is to be met with, which has been either purchased out of the public funds by our government, or provided from corporate funds by our municipalities. Some of our kings, indeed, particularly George IV., have made some fine private collections; but the nation has done nothing. Parliament, at the close of the war, voted 500,000*l.* to raise two colossal monuments to commemorate the battles of Trafalgar and Waterloo, but the money was not appropriated at the time, and no subsequent Ministry has ventured to moot the affair; and it is a perpetual subject of complaint with the Liberal party, both in Parliament and in the country, that a few thousand pounds are annually voted by the House of Commons for the purchase of a few master-pieces of ancient art for the National Gallery.

The effect of this national peculiarity is, to the last degree, destructive, both to the production of the works of art, and the formation of the national taste. Historical painting can never exist in any country but by the encouragement of government or corporations, any more than a religious school can exist without purchases by cathedrals and ecclesiastical bodies. No private house is capable of containing works of such size; few private fortunes can withstand the enormous expense with which the purchase of excellence in that department must be attended. The whole historical paintings in France have been ordered by the government or the municipalities. All those of Genoa,

Venice, Florence, or Rome, by the respective governments, whether republican or pontifical, of these different cities. The great school of Flemish painting was almost entirely owing to the purchase by the municipalities of the different cities, or the collegiate bodies of the different cathedrals. Witness the noble collection in the Stadthouse of Amsterdam, or the cathedral of Antwerp. If a great historical school in sculpture and painting had been established amongst us, under the fostering care of government and corporations, it is altogether impossible that the public taste in art could have been so very low as it is now, or that works of such mediocre excellence in portrait painting should meet with the ready sale which they actually receive. If Rubens' "Descent from the Cross," or Titian's "Conversion of St. Paul," were exposed to the habitual gaze of the people in any of our churches or cathedrals, would the people who were accustomed to see them ever tolerate the coarse and half-finished productions for which fifty and a hundred guineas are now charged, under the name of portrait pieces? If battle pieces of our peninsular victories, equivalent in merit to those of Le Brun or Tempesta, were to be seen in our royal palaces and city halls, would not a higher taste for art be generally diffused among the middle classes, and a higher standard of excellence be inevitably forced upon our painters? The public would never take mediocrity off their hands, if they had been long habituated to the perception of excellence.

Our school of portrait and landscape painting would be immeasurably elevated by the formation of a great historical school amongst us. Our painters say that it is owing to want of encouragement that they have not risen to the highest departments of art; and, without doubt, that is perfectly true in regard to sacred and historical paintings. But, in regard to landscape and portrait painting, what astonishes us is, not the want, but the *amount* of encouragement that is afforded. The surprising thing is, not that no pictures are bought, but that such high prices are given for such bad ones. And the reason of this obviously is, that the public taste, though to a certain degree directed to the Fine Arts, has not been accustomed to the habitual sight of fine works, and they do not know what excellence is.

In this respect there is a great and most important difference between the mental discipline to which a cultivated nation is subjected, in respect to the Fine Arts, and that by which the public mind is chastened and improved in literature, poetry, or music. In these departments the great works of ancient art are in everybody's hands; and for a few shillings, often for a few pence, even the humblest classes can obtain the means of

perusing the greatest works of human genius, either in poetry, philosophy, or history. The works of Homer or Virgil, of Livy or Demosthenes, of Tacitus or Plato, can be read equally, and a spirit as fully inhaled, in the farthest island of the Hebrides, as under the shadow of the Acropolis, or the Coliseum. The sublime strains of Handel or Haydn may be enjoyed, even by the working classes, in concerts to which all have access; the beautiful airs of Rossini and Mozart may be heard from every ballad-singer in the streets: but it is otherways with the productions of painting, architecture, and sculpture. No art of printing exists to communicate the delight of these arts to distant ages or nations unless the *originals themselves* are seen: no adequate conception can be formed of their beauty, nor any general taste for their excellence diffused. Experience proves that engraving, which is the sister art to printing, in painting, or stucco casts, which bear a similar analogy in sculpture, are very far indeed from supplying the place of printing, for the diffusion of the knowledge of these arts amongst mankind. To persons who already have acquired a cultivated taste, indeed, these arts afford the most delightful source of enjoyment, and the effect produced by them is sometimes very little, if at all, inferior to the original paintings or statues. The charm of Woollett's engravings, after Claude Lorraine or Raphael Morghen, after Raphael or Leonardo da Vinci, is such as to produce, in one whose eye has been habituated to drawing, very nearly the same gratification which is experienced from the immortal works from which their engravings were taken. But it is the most cultivated minds only which can feel that enjoyment. To the great mass of the people the attractions of colour or of marble are indispensable. Many nations have been trained to the highest excellence in literature or philosophy, or acquired the most perfect taste in music, by means of the press, which brought the great works of ancient genius home to every bosom; but no nation was ever yet made great in painting or sculpture by the sale and study of engravings or casts, how perfectly soever executed, by the masters of those imitative arts. In architecture, the impossibility of conveying any idea of the original by means of any small copy, is still more remarkable, for the magnitude of the building and size of the stones employed in its construction enter there as an element of beauty or sublimity, of which the most perfect copy on a small scale gives no idea whatever.

In poetry, literature, oratory, and history, the great works of antiquity, or the classic and standing authors of modern times, are in everybody's hands, and the public taste is universally formed by the study of these great models of perfection. No

boy can have left a Latin school without having had his taste formed by the great masters of antiquity; and no one can have studied at an English academy without having read something of the prose of Johnson or Addison, or the poetry of Milton or Scott. But no such mental training is provided, or can be provided, for our youth in the Fine Arts. No Apollo Belvidere or Venus de Medicis—no Parthenon or Pantheon—no Transfiguration of Raphael, or Last Communion of Domenichino—no Sunsets of Claude Lorraine, or savage scenes of Salvator Rosa are habitually brought before the eyes of our youth, or form part of the mental training of our people. Thus the whole youth of the community, with the exception of those, who form but a very limited class, who have had the benefit of foreign travelling, are brought up with minds perfectly cultivated in literature and philosophy, but wholly uninstructed in the Fine Arts; and thence our superiority in the one department, and inferiority in the other.

When a British writer engages in a work, either of poetry, oratory, philosophy, or history, he is immediately brought into competition with the great works in these departments of ancient or modern times. If he writes a history, he is read by those who are, in great part at least, familiar with the immortal works of Livy and Tacitus, of Gibbon and Hume, of Xenophon and Thucydides. Is he an orator? The eloquence of Pitt and of Fox, of Chatham and Grattan, of Cicero and Demosthenes, immediately recur to the recollection of his readers. If he is a poet, the tenderness of Virgil, the grandeur of Homer, the sentiment of Tasso, the sublimity of Milton, the magic of Shakspeare, occur to the recollection of every educated reader, the moment they open his volume. Thus the historian, the orator, and the poet amongst us, are not only themselves habituated to the study and imitation of the great works of ancient times, but their compositions are addressed to those who are equally familiar with these models of perfection, and whose taste has been formed by the constant study and *habitual* contemplation of works of excellence. They are thus brought into constant and daily competition with the greatest works of genius within several departments; and thence their astonishing greatness and success. The reading and educated public, trained to the perception of excellence, will not take mediocrity off their hands. Whereas our painters, instead of being brought into contact with the works of Michael Angelo and Raphael, of Vandyke and Claude Lorraine, are dependent for the purchase of their works upon those to whom the genius these masters and the principles of art are alike unknown.

Their anxiety is not to rival Titian or Velasquez, but to make a portrait of Mr. Josiah Thomson, or Mrs. Deborah Hodge, which shall give satisfaction to their opulent and tasteless family; they aim not at emulating Poussin or Ruysdael, but at making drawings which Lady Juliana will admit into her album, or some honourable *debutante* of fashion will honour with her admiration, or a noble marchioness display in her boudoir.

There is no country in the world, it is true, in which so vast, and varied, and magnificent a collection of paintings by the old masters exists as in Great Britain, or in which the treasures of ancient art are to be met with in such extraordinary profusion. It may be doubted whether Italy itself is equally richly endowed. But our national habits, and the peculiarities of our mixed constitution, render them almost entirely unserviceable, either in the discipline of our artists or the mental training of our people. No one can be more sensible than ourselves of the incalculable public and private blessings which have accrued, both to the character of our aristocracy and the balance of our liberties, by the combination of circumstances which have made our nobility take root in their country estates, instead of seeking refuge from *ennui*, that demon which ever haunts the great, in the theatres or corso's of great cities. We fully concur with the opinion of Mr. Burke, that on this account fox-hunting is an essential element in the British constitution. But admitting this, on the one hand, it seems equally apparent, on the other, that the tendency of our great families to spend the greater part of their time, and the largest portion of their fortunes, in beautifying their rural castles and residences, amidst a thousand moral, social, and political blessings, has been attended with this one not inconsiderable evil, that it has almost entirely obliterated the beneficial effects of these collections, both upon the efforts of our artists and the taste of our people. Works of this description, buried in the obscurity of country palaces, or in the seclusion of town residences, produce scarcely any effect upon the public mind. It is not by seeing the pictures at Burleigh, or Stow, or Castle Howard, or Hamilton Palace, with a clamorous house-keeper dinning the names of the family portraits in our ear, or a powdered lackey leading us through the galleries almost without breath, to make way for a fresh succession of paying visitors, that any impression is to be made either upon our artists or ourselves. It is by habitual and leisurely contemplation alone that this is to be effected; and situated as our treasures of art are, both in town and country, they might just as well, for all the good they do to the public taste, be on the other side of the Alps.

It is the same in architecture. The continual residence both

of our nobility and wealthy landed proprietors on their country estates has led them naturally, and most properly, to lay out great part of their fortunes in the ornament of their rural mansions; and accordingly it may safely be affirmed, that the architectural riches which the British empire possesses, in this respect, are altogether unparalleled in any other part of the world. Nothing excites the astonishment of foreigners so much as the architectural splendour of the seats of our nobility. The massy pile at Blenheim, the graceful façade of Stowe, the gorgeous splendour of Lowther Castle, the noble towers of Taymouth Castle, the chaste front of Hamilton palace, form a few among a cluster of beautiful edifices with which almost every county in the island is adorned. But although the beauty of these edifices is unquestionable, and their influence upon the public mind clearly conspicuous in the long established superior pre-eminence of the English in architecture to what they have reached in any other department of the Fine Arts, yet it is evident that their effect is not nearly so imposing, nor their influence upon the formation of taste nearly so effectual, as if the same edifices were brought into close proximity to each other in great towns. What a city would London have become if the greater part of the palaces of the English nobility, instead of being scattered from the Land's-end to the Tweed, were assembled together within a few miles of each other in the metropolis! What a noble city would Edinburgh at this moment have been, if, with its matchless advantages of stone and situation, it had been adorned by the palaces of all the Scottish nobility! The mercantile wealth which has been created in Manchester and Liverpool, and expended in the purchase of estates all over the country, and the building of stately edifices for the opulent proprietors, would, if it had been concentrated for the construction of mercantile palaces in these two great towns, have rendered them not less celebrated than Florence and Genoa for their architectural splendour; and the banks of the Clyde would long ere this have been as celebrated as the shores of the Brenta, if the commercial and manufacturing wealth of Glasgow, instead of being diffused, as it has been, in the purchase of estates and the building of costly houses, over all the west of Scotland, had been devoted, as in Venice, to the construction of splendid urban palaces for the great commercial aristocracy of a Clydesdale republic.

The overgrown wealth of the British community during the last half century, and the strong patriotic and national sentiments to which its external triumphs have given rise, have combined to produce a most extraordinary demand, of late years, for

public monuments in sculpture, both in the metropolis and in many of the chief cities in the empire; and the magnitude of the sums subscribed for these objects, which have often been of startling amount, proves the greatness of the resources in this country which may be rendered available to the encouragement of the Fine Arts. But here again the habits produced by our free constitution and mixed form of government have contributed in the most distressing manner, not only to neutralize the good effects which might otherwise have arisen from these national efforts, but in many cases to convert them into a source of positive evil. The funds for the erection of these monuments being almost all raised by private subscription, and never advanced either by government or municipalities, of course render it necessary that the persons who contribute most largely to the undertaking should form the committee of management. It by no means follows, however, that taste for the Fine Arts is in proportion to the ability of contributors to subscribe; on the contrary, it is often rather in the inverse ratio. Many persons, who cannot afford to subscribe more than 5*l.* to a monument, are more fit to be entrusted with its direction and the choice of the artist, than those who have subscribed 500*l.* It thus inevitably happens that in the great majority of the working committees of all such undertakings, to whom the management of the whole is devolved, are, from the extreme rarity of any real taste for the Fine Arts in the community, composed of persons wholly disqualified to judge properly on the matter with which they are entrusted. In such circumstances, they inevitably become the victims of reputation or intrigue. Unable to discriminate what is good from what is bad themselves, they have no alternative but to pin their faith to a great name, or yield to the pressure of private solicitation. Hence the very small number of works of excellence in that department which have appeared amongst us, notwithstanding the immense sums that have of late years been devoted to such purposes, and the vast number of successive monuments which our leading artists have been called upon to form. Chantrey alone is said to have had ninety orders of this description, for which, on an average, he got 5,000*l.* each; and yet the most cursory examination of his monuments must be sufficient to convince every observer, that great part of them were alike unworthy of his fame and his genius—that he repeated himself over and over again—and that none of his later works were at all commensurate with what might have been anticipated from the exquisite promise of his earlier conceptions.

This circumstance of the very large sums which are occasionally devoted, by public subscription, to the erection of national

monuments, or monuments to great men, coupled with the general want of taste or discernment in the persons entrusted with their administration, has come to have the most prejudicial effect on our leading artists in the noble department of sculpture. Fascinated with the magnitude of the prize which is put into the wheel, and well aware of the total incapacity of three-fourths of every committee to form any well-grounded opinion on the subject, they too often trust to nothing but the weight of an established name, or the influence of private intrigue. Their profession brings them into close proximity, and often intimate friendship, with the great and the affluent; they become objects of interest to young ladies of rank and fashion, from having taken their busts. The moment, therefore, that they hear of any monument of the kind going to be erected, they take advantage of these numerous elevated acquaintances or friendships to influence the committee, and every member soon finds himself assailed with numerous solicitations, from all quarters, in favour of some particular artist, whose merits are generally in the inverse ratio of the urgency of these applications. Men of really great minds—men conscious of genius and powers worthy of their profession, disdain all such ignoble arts; the consequence is, that they are too often passed over with undeserved neglect, and the successful competitor proves one of their more officious but less worthy rivals. If the majority of any committee determine to resist these private arts, and resolutely to give the work to the most deserving, they are met with such a storm of abuse from the disappointed intriguers, that very few men have the courage to withstand it. The public press immediately resounds with impassioned and violent declamations on the subject; and not unfrequently the majority, disgusted with the temper with which the matter comes to be discussed, retire altogether from the contest, and the intriguers ultimately carry the day, from no other cause but the absolute demerit of their favourite candidate as an artist, and his extraordinary address in the easier paths of flattery or intrigue. We have no particular individuals or cases in view in these remarks. We speak of things in general, and of the tendencies of the age, not of particular men; and no person can have been engaged in any of these undertakings, in any part of the empire, without having had too ample proof of the truth of our observations.

From what has now been said, it must at once appear that the great secondary causes to which we trace the deficiency of taste for the Fine Arts amongst us are the effect of our religious and political institutions, in turning aside all public encouragement from the Fine Arts, and preventing the exhibitions of any models of approved excellence to the habitual contemplation of

our people, and the general tenor of our popular government, which has rendered it impossible to give the adequate encouragement from the public resources to the Fine Arts. But here the observation will naturally occur to every person acquainted with history, how is the pre-eminent greatness of the Grecian republics in the Fine Arts to be explained? Were not Athens and Corinth in ancient Florence, and Venice in modern times, republican governments, and have they not risen to the very highest eminence in the Fine Arts? We admit the accuracy of the illustration; we admit the cogency of the argument; and, unless these facts can be explained in consistency with our theory, we grant that it must fall to the ground. But the distinction lies here, and it is a vital one in the present question. These republics of ancient and modern times were not democratic *nations*—they were democratic *towns* ruling a *subject territory*; but the whole political influence was vested in the citizens of one town, and generally in a limited number of those citizens. Great Britain and America are democratic *nations*, and the power is vested in a vast body of constituents, the majority of whom are hundreds or thousands of miles from the capital. *That* is the distinction; it is of the last importance in this question, and it at once explains how democratic Athens voted such immense sums for the encouragement of art, and how democratic England resolutely refuses to give anything whatever for these noble and elevating objects.

Where supreme power is practically vested in a limited body of democratic citizens, from ten to twenty thousand in number, all dwelling in a single *city*, and deriving the national and public revenue from a subject or tributary body of cities or colonies—which was exactly the case with Athens, Tyre, Corinth, Carthage, and all the republics of antiquity, as well as of Florence, Venice, Genoa, and the other Italian commonwealths in modern times—this democratic constituency in the dominant city have an immediate and personal *interest* in the erection of magnificent works of art within their walls. Having contrived to lay the whole, or the greater part, of the taxes and burdens of the state on the subject and *unrepresented* possessions of the republic—which is invariably the first step of all such democratic communities, whether commercial, as Athens and Florence, or military, as Rome and revolutionary France—they feel no additional burdens from the erection of the most costly works of art within their city, while they soon come to experience the greatest possible benefit from it, as well as from the encouragement given to art and artisans during their construction as from the durable celebrity they induce, and the concourse of strangers

to which they give rise in future times. Public taste, and the exquisite appreciation of the delicacies and enjoyments of art soon spring up, from the continual exhibition of public monuments of real excellence before the eyes of the people; they come to take a personal pride in their celebrity, and derive no small share of the enjoyment of their private lives from this habitual contemplation. Pericles erected the Parthenon, and other structures in the Acropolis, with the treasure taken from the common Greek treasury at Delphi; and when upbraided with the expense, offered to charge the whole upon himself, if they would allow his name to be inscribed on the monuments, instead of that of the people of Athens; but to that they would not consent.

In a great democratic *nation*, like the British empire, all this is reversed. Supreme power is there vested, not in the citizens of the metropolis, but in the representatives, many hundred in number, of the most distant equally with the nearest parts of the empire. The citizens of the metropolis cannot command a fiftieth part of the votes in the supreme legislature. It is in vain, in such circumstances, for them to propose that the whole commonwealth shall be taxed for great public edifices or monuments, which they alone see, and from which they alone derive either gratification, advantage, or importance. The representatives of the provinces immediately ask *cui bono* in all this; speaking the voice of their constituents, they object to every shilling spent from which they see no benefit to the places which they represent. The knowledge which universally prevails of the overwhelming majority which will at once, for these reasons, negative any considerable grant of the public money for the embellishment of the metropolis, prevents its ever being thought of. Its own citizens never acquire a taste for such ornaments—they remain insensible to its advantages; and often they are so blind as themselves to object to any grant of the public money, even for the adorning of the city in which they themselves dwell. No measure was so popular with the democracy of Athens as the application of the public funds to the encouragement of art; they even went so far as, in the days of Philip, to decree the punishment of death to any proposal to restore the navy funds, which had been appropriated to the support of the theatres, to the purposes for which they were originally destined in the defence of the state. No topic for invective is more popular with the English Radicals than the grant of 35,000*l.* to buy the Elgin marbles, or the sums expended on Buckingham Palace or Windsor Castle. The strongest ministry in Britain would soon be shaken, possibly overturned, by

a grant of 500,000*l.* to the encouragement of the Fine Arts. The weakest ministry in Athens would probably have been confirmed in their places by a similar advance. There is nothing surprising in this: it is only the same mainspring of mankind—private interest—producing opposite effects in opposite circumstances.

We are confirmed in our opinion, that the present low state of painting in general in the British empire is to be ascribed to the total want of all encouragement to its higher branches by our government and our municipalities, and the absence in consequence of any public monuments in our towns to form the taste of our people, coupled with the magnitude of the encouragement constantly held out to inferior departments, from the extraordinary excellence which one particular branch has attained. The great religious paintings of Martin and Danby are among the sublimest conceptions of human genius. We can never see the mezzotinto copies in the shop windows without pausing to gaze at them with every instant increased admiration. We will not stop to criticize them minutely: they may have many faults; doubtless they have so: but as a whole they are by far the grandest works of art which Great Britain has ever produced. They are the fit accompaniments of Milton's "*Paradise Lost*:" they breathe the spirit of Michael Angelo's "*Last Judgment*," in the Sistine Chapel. Here then is the national genius directed, by the force of individual energy, to noble, elevated, and inspiring purposes: here is a proof of what British genius can do in the highest and most sublime department of art. And what remuneration have the authors of these immortal productions received from the government, the municipalities, the nobles, the merchants, of this the greatest and richest community which ever existed upon earth? Why Martin's noblest conceptions were formed in a gaol; and Danby has been most inadequately remunerated by exhibiting his paintings, like an itinerant stage-manager, in the principal cities of the empire.

The present Government, we are well aware, are fully alive to the importance of the subject. Sir Robert Peel's exquisite private collection of paintings is a decisive proof that he is inferior to no person in the empire in refinement of taste. Ministers have shown that they at once feel that something should be done, and are desirous of doing it by the commission which they have issued to the noble and distinguished body of gentlemen who are soon to commence their investigations on this subject. But in a popular community, if any material change is to be given to public thought and inclinations, we must begin with the constituencies: we must alter the public mind if we would give

Ministers *power* to carry into effect the laudable desires with which they are animated, for the encouragement of the Fine Arts. The preceding observations, imperfect as they are, will not be thrown away if they awaken us to the first step in amendment—a sense of our deficiencies—and point out the change in the direction of public thought, which is indispensable, before the empire can be raised to the same level in the Fine Arts which it has long attained in literature, science, philosophy and arms.

ART IV.—*The Anglo-Saxon Church ; its History, Revenues, and General Character.* By HENRY SOAMES, M.A., Author of “The History of the Reformation,” “Elizabethan Religious History,” &c. The second edition, with additions and corrections. London: J. W. Parker, West Strand. 1838.

2. *The Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth-Anglo-Saxon Period.* By FRANCIS PALGRAVE, F.R.S. and F.S.A. 2 vols. 4to. London: Murray. 1832.

3. *The Saxon Chronicle : with an English Translation and Explanatory Notes.* By the Rev. J. INGRAM, B.D., formerly Anglo-Saxon Professor at Oxford. Post 4to. London: Longman. 1823.

4. *The Book of Ratramn, the Priest and Monk of Corbey, commonly called Bertram, on the Body and Blood of the Lord ; to which is added an Appendix, containing The Saxon Homily of Ælfric.* 1 vol. 12mo. Oxford: Parker. London: Whittaker. 1838.

THERE are two master propensities conspicuously manifested by those thoughtful Christians who are active in promoting the well-being of the world. The eager, the sanguine, and the benevolent are ever looking forward to some days of fancied happiness, which they fondly hope will be produced by the development of new and expansive principles. In the earnestness of their desire to ameliorate the future they scorn the strivings of the past. What has been they pronounce infantile, feeble, and contracted, compared with the needs and cravings of what must be. They chide us when we refer to semi-barbarous ages, and ponder over the musty folios of antiquated lore. The world, they remind us, is to be evangelized—the heathen to be gathered within the fold—churches to be formed—schools to be instituted—the ignorant at home to be enlightened—and the savage abroad to be humanized. They ask, what have we to do with the first

three centuries? What are Constantine and Chrysostom to us? Who can learn anything now from Pope Gregory I., or Pope Gregory VII.? Why ransack the Bodleian at Oxford, or Corpus Christi at Cambridge, for the musty manuscripts of Saxon times? Our forefathers were but "babes in Christ;" we are the "strong men," who pity, while we pass by, their days of twilight dimness.

On the other hand, the deeply read and the maturely contemplative feel compelled to chase away these dazzling visions of hope. They are too intimate with the stern records of experience. By roaming at large over the rugged fields and the cultivated plains of history, they have acquired that far-seeing eye which is nearly akin unto prophecy; they are too familiar with the lights and shades of the distant prospect to be surprised at the mirage or to anticipate an oasis. Hence they put little trust in hasty schemes of universal benevolence, and in modern contrivances for unity of action. Having been accustomed to trace, with laborious precision, the growth and spreading of the tree of life among the nations, they turn a deaf ear to the crude and common-place efforts of these days to improve upon God's method of propagating the Gospel. Thus they are too apt to settle down into inactivity and despondency, and to enjoy the luxury of discontent as *laudatores temporis acti*.

It is well for the man of energetic and practical wisdom, whose duty requires him to legislate for either the State or the Church, that he should judiciously combine these two opposite tendencies. Such a man will not hastily pronounce any portion of our nation's history or our Church's records puerile or profitless. The British senator—the Anglican presbyter—has good reason to enquire meekly and patiently into the wisdom or the folly of forefathers whose deeds have come down to us surrounded with the hazy glory of ancestral renown; he will be inspired with an ardent hope that the more he ponders over "the tales of other times," the better will he brace himself to provide successfully for the exigences of his own. The Christian philosopher will, therefore, be glad to learn how he can render the fragments of Anglo-Saxon lore serviceable to the *present position* of our national and ecclesiastical polity. In the researches of a Palgrave and a Whelock, an Ingram and a Soames, he will find the most precious relics of our early English constitution; he will see how the grain of mustard seed took deep root in the isle of our birth, and grew, in spite of storm and wind, till at length earls and kings were glad enough to become as the fowls of the air, and hide themselves for shelter under its branches. He will perhaps be surprised to find that, instead of the State establishing the Church, **THE CHURCH ESTABLISHED THE STATE.**

e will see how the prerogatives of kings, the privileges of nobles, and the liberties of commoners were defined, upheld, and sanctioned by the simple and scriptural piety of Anglo-Saxon Christianity. He will mark how the principles of *Church procession*, imported from Antioch, and Arles, and Rome, flourished under our "northern sky"—how they soon manifested their powers of fixedness, unworldliness, and growth. Very soon barons and thanes begin to interweave holy wedlock and Christian baptism into the law of inheritance; they withhold allegiance from every monarch who would place children on the throne in defiance of the sanctity of marriage or the sacrament of baptism. Kings are "behallowed" as well as bishops; earls and abbots sit in conclave together to fashion the laws of the land on the model of the laws of God; the lords of the soil provide bountifully for the religious instruction of their serfs and vassals—they rear the abbey and endow the monastery, that "Gospel learning" should ever find an altar and a home, far away from the tramp and the turmoil of fight and feud. The study of our Saxon literature and laws, institutions and polity, will supply the citizen and the scholar, the legislator and the missionary, with their respective lessons; while the Anglican churchman will feel his zeal confirmed, and his orthodoxy strengthened, by every fresh meditation on the careful wisdom of these founders of our national greatness.

It is disheartening to pursue, for year after year, a course of study with which the modern scholarship of the age owns no sympathy. Every fresh traveller in these paths, so long untraveller, has, on this account, been hailed by us as a friend. Even when we differ from his conclusions, we view him rather as a brother, to be encouraged, than as an author, to be criticised. Although Mr. Soames's manner of producing his materials is exceedingly unattractive, and his arrangements most disjointed and confused, yet he has done good service to a cause in which he has so perseveringly laboured. The MSS. which our public libraries at Oxford and Cambridge contain, illustrative of the doctrines and discipline introduced by Augustine and his predecessors, we have always highly appreciated, and Mr. Soames is entitled to our thanks for having made these treasures more readily accessible. In 1830 he published "An Enquiry into the Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church," being his subject in the Bampton Lectures for that year; and he succeeded in showing that the errors and corruptions of modern Rome, which we rejected at the Reformation, never formed part of the creeds and teaching of our Anglo-Saxon forefathers. Thus to bring again before the public elaborate

proofs of this important position, was doing good service to our own branch of the Catholic community: since Lingard, in his "*Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*," had insisted on the identity between the creeds and worship of the days of Alfred and those of the Tudors. Here we join issue with this plausible historian. We appeal to the testimony of facts. He who concerns himself to investigate this branch of the controversy with Rome will derive ample information from the works whose titles are written above. Each is valuable and first-rate of its kind, and *all* should be diligently studied by every man who puts his hand to reform our Senate and our Church, or who would earn renown by strengthening our episcopal government at home, and establishing its blessings abroad.

Sir Francis Palgrave's work, on "*The Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth—Anglo-Saxon Period*," furnishes the facts on which our reasoning is to be built, together with many collateral illustrations. The fifth chapter more particularly relates to our present discussion. It contains an account of the origin of our present ecclesiastical polity, of the earliest organization of the Church, the formation of its episcopal dioceses, of the erection of parish churches, the settlement of parochial clergy, and the endowment of its ministers by grants of land, payments of tithes, and other subsidiary dues and fees chargeable upon the produce of the land. The councils of the clergy held at Hertford, Hatfield, and Cealcinth, are recorded; the import of the canons issued by archbishops and bishops explained, together with the Church laws of Ethelwolf, Edgar, and Canute. These provincial and national synods were confirmed by the sovereigns; and bishops, when appointed, were admitted to the possession of their temporalities by royal charter. In these early records, no appeal to any foreign pontiff occurs—no swearing allegiance to the Bishop of Rome. When the monarch called his barons to consult for the nation's welfare, bishops sat in conclave with earldormen, and presbyters (mass-thanes) with (world-thanes) country squires. Sir Francis Palgrave is equally impartial in specifying the abuses which sprang from the barbarism of the times and the imperfections of individuals: and his narrative is a picture of human nature too true and instructive to be passed hastily over by the careless and the superficial.

The edition of the "*Saxon Chronicle*," by a late professor of Anglo-Saxon, is too well known in his own University to need our commendation; its translation, and the grammar prefixed, render its contents instantly accessible. The preface answers the questions—"what does it contain?" and "by whom was it

written?" and we have no other duty to perform than to bring it before the notice of those who wish to become acquainted with the days of our national and ecclesiastical infancy. We now proceed to elucidate the views already expressed. We have often asserted, in previous numbers of our *Quarterly Review*, that the Church to whose services we devote its pages is an *old Church*. We are not content with resting its claim to antiquity on the similarity of its doctrines to those anciently taught at Philippi or Alexandria. We are not satisfied with saying, "it is as old as the Bible," and then, in the same breath, allowing it to be a "law-made Church," dating its origin from the caprice of a Henry, or the good policy of a Cranmer. Its Articles are not, in any sense, its foundation. It must be reiterated again, that our present ecclesiastical polity had already existed eight hundred years when its reformation took place. It was never destroyed; it was simply restored to its original independence of action, and cleansed from its accumulated impurities. The true apostles of the English Church were Gregory and Augustine; its real fathers, Paulinus and Wilfred, Theodore and Egbert; its elder brethren, Bede and Alcuin, Ælfric and Alfred. So far from being an Act of Parliament Church, founded through the exertions, or indebted to the agency, of either Luther or Calvin, it had a name and a permanence long before "acts of parliament" existed; it had defenders of the faith once committed to the saints long before Luther or Calvin ever surprised or enlightened the world. As our Latimers and our Ridleys never committed the sin of schism—as they never seceded from the body of the baptized into Christ, while they testified unto death against the heresies of their bigoted brethren, our Reformation has little in common with that of the continent. There, the rulers of the world rose up with the sword of flesh, and the soldiers of the faith ultimately separated from the body which they could not convert, and set up new assemblies for themselves. But here, we were happily spared this direful shock. We had but to return to the good old Ante-Norman creeds and practices; our own bishops led the way—first, in throwing off the usurped authority of the Bishop of Rome—next, in gradually cleansing out the anti-scriptural dogmas of the middle ages, in elevating Holy Writ to its ancient position and authority over faith and practice, in re-arranging the forms of social worship, in reproducing the old treatises on sacramental communion, and then in obtaining the sanction of king, lords, and commons, to place upon their arduous undertaking the seal of the nation's approval. By thoroughly imbuing our minds with this view

of the Reformation, we are equally prepared to uphold our Church against the opposite attacks of Romish and ultra-Protestant Dissent. By the same arguments we convict both of historical ignorance and of needless schism; and we know no better means of giving every man a reason of the hope that is in him than by teaching him the historical witness for the truths which we hold dearer than life.

With the view of correcting some very prevalent errors, we shall enter a little further into some interesting details. When recording the venerated names of the fathers of the English branch of the Catholic community, we did not forget the previous existence of Christian Churches among *the Britons*. We would not overlook the testimonies so carefully collected by Usher, and Burgess, and other laborious divines, to the successful labours of apostolic men among the Pagan Britons. We acknowledge, with Mason, in his "*Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*," "*cum Britones fuerunt Catholici, Saxones Gentiles*." (Lib. ii. cap. 5.) Our assertions are these, that the Saxon "Gentiles" had almost utterly destroyed the British "Catholici" before they were themselves converted to Christianity; that the remnant of British Christians were driven to the mountains of Wales; that a long interval elapsed before the Saxon idolators were converted to the faith; and that we are lineally descended, in episcopal succession, from the Theodores and Egberts of Saxon times. We find the British and Saxon Churches frequently confounded in works where we should not expect it. An instance occurs in Mr. Gladstone's valuable treatise on "Church Principles considered in their Results." In page 312, he expresses himself with great ambiguity, and introduces the very confusion against which we would guard. "The English Church (says he), as she existed for centuries before she came into ecclesiastical connexion with Rome." On this point, Sir F. Palgrave is worthy of attentive perusal. Bede has indeed informed us that British bishops were found by Augustine and his attendants, and invited by him to assist in preaching the Gospel to the Angles. Some complied, while others stood aloof: but the progress of events soon annihilated the independent existence of British Churches, till they became incorporated with the institutions which the Edwins, the Oswalds, and the Inas fostered and consolidated.

The character and influence of these institutions should be the next object of enquiry. They are well explained in the works under review. Here we see the foundation of the English constitution laid simply and firmly on the CHRISTIAN COVENANT. The Church becomes the rock which bears the fabric of the State. As the episcopal principle is cherished, maintained,

and extended, the monarchical gathers strength and stability. Long before kings were at ease on their thrones, or barons safe within their castles, the work of the Lord was prospering in the hands of the zealous missionaries from the see of Rome, and the plan was devised of ordaining twelve bishops as suffragan to London, and another twelve as suffragan to York. Silently, yet efficiently, the spiritual kingdom wins its victories. Paulinus and Wilfrid, Alcuin and Egbert in the north, with Theodore, Aldhelm, and Ælfric in the south, worked a surprising change in the habits, pursuits, and character of their barbarian flocks. Learning is encouraged—holy Scripture is systematically studied—monasteries, the only form of schools and colleges in those days, are founded and endowed—parish churches are scattered over the land—parish priests settled among the villagers—tithes set apart by the landlords—church shot and plough alms collected from the tenantry for the necessities of worship and the care of the poor. Thus, before the Danes overran the country, and put to the sword its laborious instructors in “righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come,” the claims of the Christian Church on the property of the landlord, the produce of the soil, and the labour of the serfs, were duly ratified by successive laws under Ina and Althelstan, Edgar and Ethelred.

Before we can derive those lessons of wisdom which we are seeking, we must answer a question of importance. “Of what practical use (it is asked) can it be to us to turn back to those dark ages? Our religion is changed since then; the nation has applied the tithes and church-rates to the support of another faith: those were Popish times—these are Protestant; and as we have changed our religion since then, in compliance with the public voice, we may re-apply our tithes and church-rates again and again, on the very principles adopted at the Reformation.” To adopt these assertions is to beg the whole question, and to make the most flagrant misstatements. The opinion that the English nation has abolished one Church and set up another since Saxon times, is too prevalent among our senators, our clergy, and our intelligent laity; and we know of no better material for the pages of the *Church of England Quarterly Review* than the information and the reasonings which tend to explode it. We are prepared to contend, that the doctrines taught by our Saxon forefathers, in the cathedrals which stand where they built them, are *mainly the very same which are now taught in those venerable structures*. This is our position, which a very matured investigation of original documents has enabled us to pronounce *impregnable*; and in the remainder of this article we shall endeavour to show the reader how he may arrive at the

same conclusion. Our religion has never been changed by the State. To speak of "Popish times," as contrasted with "Protestant times," often invokes a great fallacy; and we are thoroughly persuaded, from watching the course of religious controversies and of popular societies for the last few years, that the greatest delusions are propagated by the writers and the orators whom the "religious world" overwhelm with their hasty applause.

While we take up our position as impregnable, we willingly admit, at the outset, that our early worship was mingled with some superstitions; that the corruptions of the fourth and fifth centuries were partially introduced among us in the sixth and seventh; and that as the penitential canons of the Church contemplated crimes as well as sins, they necessarily imposed temporal punishments analogous to those of our houses of correction and county gaols. Yet we are prepared to bear witness, that no unscriptural doctrine was imposed upon the Christian community as *an article of the Church's faith*—no anti-scriptural practice was canonically enjoined as *essential to salvation*. The modern Romanist, through his anxiety to uphold his claim to be the only *ecclesia semper eadem*, will contend earnestly against these positions, and will endeavour to gain over the "liberal" elector, or the indifferent member of Parliament, to his view of the case. Too often he will succeed: let him, however, be confronted with a well-read Churchman, who knows the contents of our Saxon homilies, and the nature of the testimony which the Oxford and Cambridge MSS. convey, and he will soon confute the shallow arguments of either political liberalism or priestly craft.

With the hope, then, of throwing some light on a subject of such especial interest, we proceed to a review of the *doctrines* taught by the missionaries to the Saxons, and of the bishop who sent them. To begin with Gregory I. Many of his letters to bishops, kings, and queens are still extant. From these, from the homily on St. Gregory's day, and from his instructions to Augustine after his successful settlement in England, we gather sufficient witness to his humble piety, his untiring zeal, and his judicious tolerance. We may easily ascertain how far his successors at Rome imbibe his spirit or preach his gospel, from a small Collectanea from his writings, published at Oxford in 1618, and lately reprinted. The distinction between Gregory I. and Gregory VII. is perceptible at once from his celebrated disclaimer of *universal supremacy*: "*Ego, fidenter dico, quisquis universalem sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat in elatione sua ANTI-CHRISTUM præcurrit, quia*

superbiendo se cæteris præponit." Every namesake from the seventh to the sixteenth is here plainly condemned. On the celebrated passage of the Rock, he comments thus: "*In petrâ ecclesiæ, hoc est in CONFESSIOE beati Petri.*" In commenting on 1 Cor. iii. 13, which modern Romanists strain into purgatory, he never alludes to it as an article of his creed. The part which he took against image worship, although notorious enough, is confirmed by his own letter to Serenus, bishop of Marseilles; his exclusion of the books of Maccabees from the canon of Scripture, and his frequent appeals to the written word, as containing the full and sufficient revelation of God, helps us onwards to the proof that the Cranmers and the Ridleys of Tudor times did but restore to their country the old Catholicity of purer days than their own. In matters of faith and discipline he received the decisions of the first four general councils, and *those only*, as of paramount authority; while in his answer to Augustine, who asked advice concerning the different usages of Gaul, Britain, and Rome, his spirit is shown to be at once tolerant and Catholic:—

"I am of opinion, that whether in the Roman Church, or in those of France, or in any other Church, you shall have discovered anything that may be more pleasing to Almighty God, you would carefully make choice of it, and infuse into the Church of the English, that as yet is new in the faith, by a particular appointment, whatsoever out of many Churches you have been able to collect. Wherefore, out of the several Churches, whatsoever things are pious, whatsoever things are religious, whatsoever things are just, these make choice of; and these being collected, and as it were bound up together, fix in the minds of the English, that they may grow into practice."—*Hom. in Greg. diem.* Elstob 1709; preface.

A spirit far different from this prevailed during the episcopate of the Leos and the Clements, and the Tridentine councillors.

On passing to Augustine, we find him better known by the labours he undertook, and the episcopate which he founded, than by the doctrinal system which he promulgated. The homily which records his self-denying efforts in "preaching the word of life with all diligence," contains not one word of modern Popery. In a *Sermon. Cathol. de Sanc. Petro*, we have the following comment preserved in the Saxon language:—

"Augustine taught that Peter in a figure signified the Church, because Christ is Petra, a rock—Petrus the Christian people, because he had in him the type of the Christian Church. Christ said, 'Thou art stony, and upon this stone,' that is, upon *that belief which thou now confessest*, 'I build my Church.'"—*Whelock's Bede*, p. 405.

Gosseline has preserved his first sermon. It is simply an explanation of the Apostles' Creed, urging faith in the Saviour

alone as necessary to salvation, and containing no trace of Mary-worship, nor any expression which might not fall from the lips of the humblest "local preacher" appointed by that erratic bishop, John Wesley. Like other remnants of the Saxon homilies, it might be preached in any assembly of the baptized either at home or abroad; and no listener would ever suppose that the divines of Trent could claim any kindred with the enterprising author. As soon as the Church became securely settled among the restless barbarians of the day, while it tamed their fierceness, civilized their manners, and sanctified their affections, it began to bring forth the fruits of practical learning and advanced scholarship. Egbert and Alcuin, Ælfric, Alfred, and Bede, are names which have been handed down to us as the lights of their day and generation, and their writings afford us the clearest possible proofs of the freedom of our forefathers from the doctrinal heresies and the ecclesiastical tyranny of modern Rome.

For instance, all their eminent scholars laboured to make holy Scripture intelligible to the multitude. Translations of the most practical parts of the sacred volume were common; and the remains of them to this day confute the modern assumption, that the sword of the Spirit is a dangerous weapon in the hands of the laity. They were no mean critics in separating the spurious from the genuine. Adopting the canon of Jerome, Bede, Ælfric, Alcuin, and his pupil, Raban Maur, *all rejected the apocryphal writings*. Theodore and Egbert, archbishops of Canterbury and York respectively, founded and endowed grammar and bible schools; and had it not been for the ruthless devastations of the Danes, the polished Normans might have taken many a lesson in Christian simplicity from the Saxon peasant. Their creeds were the three creeds of the Church Catholic; they were translated into the vulgar tongue, and authoritatively explained by homilies, composed by their bishops, and impressed upon the worshippers by their parochial ministers. They had many sacramentals, and but two sacraments.

Their sacramentals, consisting of aids and appliances of worship, were more complicated and more superstitious than we in more enlightened days feel necessary for growth in holiness; they were imported at various periods from Italy and Gaul, and were received with the blind reverence of a mistaken devotion. They were never bound upon the conscience as articles of faith, or as observances necessary to salvation; they were needless additions to the truth as it is in Jesus, rather than essential violations of its spirit. The Church, too, carried within it the best corrective to their injurious tendency—a firm persuasion

of the sufficiency of holy Scripture; and as scriptural knowledge increased, so would it gradually have chased away the dark shadows of useless ceremonies, had not Danish fury and Norman bondage spread ruin and devastation over the country. A purgatorial fire was thought credible; prayers for the dead, and prayers to them, were allowable; penitential services were appointed and sacramental penances were enforced; and in the time of Alfred the second commandment was omitted from the decalogue, lest the growing practice of image-worship should appear glaringly inconsistent with the laws of God. On the other hand, their laws which compelled the hallowing of the Sabbath among slaves as well as nobles; their strictly requiring of the bishop elect to teach the people by the words and examples of Scripture alone (Brit. Mus., Cotton. MSS., Tiberius, a. III., f. 91); their truly apostolic method of consecrating bishops; and their comprehensive views of Catholic unity, render their proceedings worthy of attentive regard in conducting our modern missions.

Mr. Soames, by printing and translating the homilies on St. Peter's day and on the Catholic faith, in his notes on his Bampton Lectures, has rendered this "bookish craft" accessible to all, and leaves us no other duty than that of urging their perusal upon every sound Churchman. Their protest against the innovations of modern Rome consists in admitting a married clergy, and their advocating the equality of other apostles with St. Peter; in correct views of the rock, and the power of the keys; in due deference to the Roman see, without any acknowledgment of its absolute and inherent supremacy over Christendom; and, above all, in defining the number of the sacraments to be two, and in avoiding the Papal fiction of the *bodily* presence of the Saviour in the eucharist. However nearly some superstitions of the seventh and eighth centuries may approach to the decrees of Trent, we can vindicate the claim of our Saxon forefathers to be *true protesters* on the doctrine of the sacraments. Into this question we must enter more at length.

We first establish the number. In the Bodleian library there is a Saxon MS. of a homily of Bishop Lupas, in which we read as follows:—"Two things are, through God's might, so great and important, that never can any man therein injure or diminish anything—baptism and husel-hallowing. Whatever may be done, God's own might is in these deeds, through a holy mystery." (Junii 99). Whelock has made the first of these sentences easily accessible; while, having quoted enough for our purpose, we merely remark that the context is precisely in agreement with our twenty-sixth Article, and as directly op-

posed to the Tridentine doctrine of intention. In MSS. Junii 22 we have the grace of baptism stated :—

“Twice we are in this life born : the former birth is fleshly, of father and of mother ; the other birth is ghostly, when we are born again in the holy baptism, in which all our sins are forgiven us, through the Holy Ghost’s gift. The third birth is in the general rising again, in which our bodies will be born again into incorruptible bodies.”

In the public library of Cambridge, MSS. li. 4-6, p. 557, we have a comparison between the ordinary processes of birth and growth which are familiar to the eye of sense, and that spiritual birth and growth in which consists the life of the soul. And then we read as follows :—

“The ghostly birth, viz., that man be born to God in the holy baptism, through the Holy Ghost, is not obvious to us, for that we cannot see what is there performed in the baptized persons. Thou seest him be dipped in the sheer water, and again drawn up with the same hue that he had before, ere he dived ; but the Holy Mother, that is, God’s Church, knows that the child is bedipped sinful into the font, and is taken up washed from sins through that holy baptism. Through Adam’s transgression, who broke God’s commandment, those children are sinful ; but through the grace of God himself their sins are blotted out, and they become God’s men, and they of fleshly are made ghostly, and are called God’s bairns, just as the book tells us.”

The sacrament of the Lord’s supper next demands our attention. We have to enquire whether that article in the Romish creed which Archbishop Tillotson so aptly terms its “great burning article,” was received and propagated by the first bishops of our Church. It is most important to ascertain this historical fact, because it is often argued that the original endowments and charges on the land for the support of the Church were made in Popish times—that they were intended to propagate other doctrines than those to which they are now applied—that the bishops and priests to whom our Saxon earls and thanes granted large and valuable tracts of country taught the creeds and practices of Popery. Hence it is said, as we have once diverted this property from its original use, according to the national will, so we may again cut and carve it for the benefit of the sects and denominations, as soon as they are strong enough to compel the nation to listen to their clamours. The House of Commons is sometimes compelled to listen to such assertions, and to the apparently cogent reasonings for which they form the ground-work, and thus the unwary and the uninitiated are tempted to vote in favour of measures which otherwise they would have manfully resisted. The question is not merely theological ; it is not to be turned over by the practical layman to the speculative leisure of the antiquarian divine : it is rather a

question on which every British legislator may be called both to listen and to speak, and which every innovator would do well to ponder before he ventures to destroy by piecemeal spoliation the time-worn fabric which his fathers have reared.

A modern Romanist will never surrender the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Believing it to be a part of God's revelation, he holds it to have been handed down from the age of the apostles, and to have pervaded, at all times and places, every branch of the Catholic Church. Knowing, as he does, that Saxon Christianity came from Rome, he will, if possible, find this dogma among the treasure ; and although various scholars, whose names are familiar to every student of early English history, have ascertained that it is not to be found there, yet, from time to time, the champions of the Romish schism in England revive and repeat their oft-refuted objections. Lingard has attempted to claim the homilies which we are about to quote as favourable to his own creed ; and a notorious barrister of the Romish faith thought it worth his while publicly to contradict some statements of the writer of this review. Bold contradictions will succeed with those careless Churchmen who are ignorant of the true method of conducting the controversy with Rome, and with those reckless ultra-Protestants whose sects have little in common with the Catholic Church ; but they never can succeed where the views embodied in this article have been diligently worked out by patient research, and are thereby deeply interwoven with our most earnest thoughts.

That we may strip the subject entirely of its usual garb of technical divinity, we shall confine our attention to a single treatise and its translation. A priest and monk of Corbey, who lived about A.D. 840, has exercised no little influence over this branch of the enquiry. He wrote a treatise "On the Body and Blood of the Lord," in which his views are precisely those of our present articles and liturgy. Its value to us here arises from the fact, that Ælfric's Easter homily, which was periodically read every Easter Sunday, is a *translation from it, almost word for word*. Both the original and the Saxon version still exist in MSS. at the public libraries of Oxford and Cambridge, and have been printed at various periods. After being the vehicle of saving truth to the people before the dominion of the Normans, it did good service to the cause of Christ, by bringing Ridley to think seriously on the nature of the eucharist. By perusing it, he became persuaded of the gross corruptions of this sacrament in his day, and was the means of leading Cranmer to the purer fountains of ancient theology. Bishop Warburton, in his "Literary Remains," lately published, refers to this tract as converting

Ridley; the detailed account of the manner in which it permanently changed his views is recorded in the third book of his life, by Gloster Ridley; and the martyr's reference to it before the commissioners at Oxford, A.D. 1555, is too well known to need repetition. The public attention of both reformed and unreformed was henceforth universally turned towards this remarkable treatise, and its value is again most honourably confirmed by its being numbered among the prohibited books of the Council of Trent, A.D. 1559. Clement VIII., Bellarmine, and other consistent advocates of the novel creed, have stamped it with their "black mark of condemnation;" while the time-serving ecclesiastics of Douay pretend to be utterly indifferent concerning it. They "care not greatly for this book," and find little "worthy of reprehension," because their policy would be better served by its dropping quietly out of print and of memory together. English Churchmen, however, did not so soon comply with the wishes of the foreign schismatics. Ælfric's homily, with his two epistles, were set forth by Archbishop Parker with his own signature, and those of the Archbishop of York and thirteen bishops, as documents of authority, and as their proof of a return to the good old paths which were trodden by the Bedes and the Augustines of purer days. Strype gives us its title (Parker, vol. i., p. 472), "A Testimony of Antiquity, showing the Ancient Faith of the Church of England, touching the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord, here publicly preached, and also received, in the Saxons' time, above seven hundred years ago."

Having thus established the importance of this treatise, it becomes necessary to examine its contents. Lingard shall produce his own passage, which, he says, "no Catholic divine will pronounce repugnant to the Catholic doctrine."—(*Antiq. Anglo-Sax.* ch. 1810, p. 502). And yet this is just the reason why every Romish divine ought at once to repudiate it, for he must be a man of singular hardihood who will persist in seeing *matters of fact* differently from Parker, Lisle and Usher, Whelock and Hicks, Collier and Henry. For instance, after quoting the passage which Mr. Soames pronounces "perhaps the most remarkable," he adds: "How such language would sound from a Protestant pulpit, I shall not pretend to determine." Our readers shall at least judge how it becomes the pages of a Church of England Review. He shall have the benefit of his own translation, though we prefer that of 1623, as more idiomatic:—

"Much is there between the invisible might of the holy husel and the visible appearance of its own kind. In its own kind it is corruptible bread and corruptible wine; but after the might of the divine

word, it is truly Christ's body and his blood, not indeed in a bodily, but in a ghostly manner. Much is there between the body in which Christ suffered and the body which is hallowed to husel. Truly the body in which Christ suffered was born of the flesh of Mary, with blood and with bone, with skin and with sinews, in human limbs, with a reasonable living soul. But his ghostly body, which we call *husel*, is gathered of many corns, without blood and bone, without limbs and a soul; and therefore nothing is to be understood in it after a bodily, but all is to be understood after a ghostly manner. Whatever there is in the husel which giveth us the substance of life, that cometh of the ghostly might and invisible operation.....This sacrament is a pledge and a figure—Christ's body is truth. This pledge we hold sacramentally till we come to the truth, and then this pledge will end. Truly it is, as we said before, Christ's body and his blood, *not after a bodily, but after a ghostly manner.*"

May we not now retort, and wonder how this extract would sound in St. Peter's at Rome, or in the next Papal bull which may issue from the Vatican? The homily contains many simple and valuable comments on holy Scripture. On 1 Cor. x. 1-4, where St. Paul uses the phrase, "that rock was Christ," we have—"Neither was that stone then, from which the water ranne, bodily Christ, but *it signified Christ.*" In explaining John vi. 51, we read—

"He is called "bread" by signification, and a Lambe, and a Lion, and a Mountaine. He is called bread, because he is our life and angels' life. But Christ is *not* so, notwithstanding, *after true nature*, neither Bread, nor a Lambe, nor a Lion.....Certainly this housell, which we do now hallow at God's altar, is a REMEMBRANCE of Christ's body, which he offered for us, and of his blood, which he shed for us: so he himself commanded—'Do this in my *remembrance.*'"

After reading this, who will assent that any change of the elements of bread and wine into the very body and blood, soul, and divinity of our Lord, was contemplated by Ælfric? Who will not decide that, while the real presence was fully recognized, a corporal presence was utterly repudiated? Well would it have been for the world had such catholicity as this been preserved among us: but, alas! the Norman Conquest brought with it a long train of spiritual as well as temporal woes. It would prove tedious to quote another passage to the same effect from those pastoral epistles which Archbishop Parker and his brother bishops signed and approved. We are content with referring the reader to the MSS., Sermon 121, in the Bodleian (the first beginning at folio 101, and the second at folio 111), and to the Parker MSS. (cclxv.) at C. C. C., Cambridge. Foxe, in his "Acts and Monuments," (vol. ii.: London, 1610, pp. 1041, &c.); Lisle, in 1623; Whelock, in 1643; Miss Elstob,

in 1709, have repeatedly made public portions of these valued relics, and thus brought before the Church of their own day the identity in doctrine and practice between the founders of our Church in the seventh century and its restorers in the fifteenth.

Here we take leave of our subject, with a strong recommendation to every reader to enter on this instructive field of research, and to make good use of the labours of Soames, Ingram, and Palgrave. If we have proved the positions with which we set out we have done all which we undertook. We do not ask any verdict now on speculative doctrines, but on matters of fact ; we do not call upon the statesman to decide whether the divines of Trent were better Catholics than those of Bishop Wearmouth and of Jarrow ; but we do call upon him to rise superior to the historical ignorance of the shallow orators of the day—we do urge him to qualify himself to contend vigorously against the superficial deluders of the multitude, who are keen enough to profit by the confusion which they induce.

To the Churchman, who is anxiously asking for the old paths, it is some satisfaction to perceive that we can nationally rejoice that our old ways are the best ways—that we have preserved among us the true succession of scriptural truth and episcopal order—and that the very same consolations which sustained the dying spirit of a Bede are provided for the peasant who ploughs the soil which he trod. The Anglican Churchman may thus rejoice that he holds intimate fellowship with the holy and the self-denying among his ruder ancestors, who took the righteous of old as their examples in all afflictions and patience, and thus, by living a martyr's life, were ever ready to receive the martyr's crown. Let but this spirit revive among our clergy and our laity, and Romanism and Dissent can never make way among the educated of the land. An accurate knowledge of the manner in which the Gospel was preached to our heathen forefathers—how the Church was reared and the State established by its conservative power—how cruelly the light of life everlasting was obscured by Roman rapacity and Italian usurpation—how clearly it was restored by episcopal zeal and unflinching endeavour—this knowledge will be as a two-edged sword, and will successfully repel, by the very same blow, the artful assaults of the political papist and of the restless sectarian.

To all who are interested in the extension of episcopacy in our colonies, this study is absolutely essential. New Zealand and North America are noble fields for a trial of the old principles which were so successful here a thousand years ago ; and, with such models before him, the missionary bishop, attended by his presbyters, will effect more for the evangelization of his

diocese than by following the crude irregularities of an age which is but a babe in the practice of *true Church principles*. Let the infant be nourished with the right food, and, by God's blessing, it will become a strong man, armed with His resistless might.

ART. V.—*The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice ; or a Defence of the Catholic Doctrine, that Holy Scripture has been, since the Times of the Apostles, the sole Divine Rule of Faith and Practice to the Church, against the Dangerous Errors of the Authors of the Tracts for the Times, and the Romanists, &c.* By W. GOODE, M.A. London: Hatchards.

ARE we living in the heart of Christendom? Is this the nineteenth century of the Christian era? Do we behold around us institutions venerable for their antiquity and illustrious for their learning, and of which we make our boast as fruits of Christianity and bulwarks of the true faith? How, then, at this time of the day, and in such a land as this, does it happen, that we have to discuss mere elementary points—the “first principles of the doctrine of Christ” (Heb. vi.)—the selfsame subjects which St. Paul, and the other apostles, had to explain at the beginning, and press upon the earliest believers in the Gospel? It is because religion has to do with *the heart* of man, and not with *his head alone*; and the “heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.” It is because religion is not a mere science, in which we may enter at once upon the labours of our predecessors, and commence at that point to which they have advanced the science; but in religion, as it is with “the heart man believeth unto righteousness” (Rom. x. 10), so each man must begin at the beginning; each man's *heart* must first be made right before God; it is *individual* work in every one who would come to the knowledge of the truth; it is work which we cannot do by deputy—cannot assume as a demonstration—cannot inherit as a patrimony; it is between God and the soul of man, and for it each man must give account at the day of judgment, when the secrets of *all hearts* shall be revealed.

And therefore it is that Christianity is adapted to all mankind; it speaks alike to the high and low, to the educated and the ignorant, to the civilized and barbarian. It needs not to be preceded by these fortuitous distinctions, because all have a *heart* which may be spoken to; and the heart being gained to religion, all secondary blessings follow in her train. And of

faith every man is capable, from Abel to Noah, from Noah to the end of the world. Faith in the heart is that which binds all generations of the Church into unity, where "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free" (Col. iii. 11); and this explains how it is that in the poor and the simple we behold such a clearness, vigour, and strength of faith, hope, and charity, as seems to surpass that of the educated. The heart of the poor, when once set right, is not turned aside to other things, but is intent solely upon the "one thing needful," and gives itself exclusively to that thing.

Therefore it is not so unaccountable as it may at first appear, that ever and anon the Church should have to clear the foundations of our faith—to establish and confirm first principles of truth. And at all the great epochs in her history—at all those times when contending interests, prejudices, and passions, have brought into action opposing principles, we can only maintain the truth by standing firm for fundamental principles, and by showing how these are endangered in the heat of contending parties, how they may be perilled by both parties in opposite ways.

It is beyond question that the writers of the *Tracts for the Times* have fallen into very "dangerous errors," as asserted by Mr. Goode in his title-page; and we have not been backward in asserting this of them, and have endeavoured to point out these errors, and protest against them, on many occasions. These errors are of a class with those into which mere *High Churchmen* have usually fallen, and are akin to the errors of Romanism. They spring from so exaggerating the importance of forms as to exclude spirituality from their system. But it is possible to fall into the opposite error in opposing theirs—the error common to those who are called *Low Churchmen*, which springs from exaggerating spirituality (or rather distorting it, for it cannot be exaggerated), till forms, and even the Church itself, as a body, are wholly excluded from their system. It will be our endeavour, in the remarks which we have to make, to do justice to the learning and research of Mr. Goode; while we feel ourselves constrained to say, that in some instances the doctrines which he opposes appear to us far nearer to the truth than the Low Church doctrines he advocates. And we say thus much at the commencement, that we may remark with all freedom on both parties as we proceed.

Mr. Goode's book amply confirms an assertion we made on a former occasion, with reference to the *catena patrum* of the Oxford Tracts—since he has selected from the fathers, passages

as numerous and as clear, in support of his opinions, as the writers of the Tracts had brought forward in support of theirs: which shows us palpably that, in order to form or corroborate our *principles*, we must have recourse to *principles*—to those principles of faith and conduct which prompted the expressions and practices of the fathers, and by which we are enabled to interpret and reconcile obscure and discordant passages in their writings: and so not putting them, on the one hand, in the place of the truth, nor, on the other, thinking their witness of no importance at all, but regarding them as witnesses for the truth, our faith will be strengthened thereby “to run with patience the race set before us, looking to Jesus, the author and finisher of faith.”

These discrepancies, which appear in collections from the same writers, when the collections are made with the view of sustaining opposite principles, tend to destroy all confidence in the fathers, as authorities or guides in doubtful or disputed points; and such is the avowed conviction of Mr. Goode, notwithstanding a few *salvos* of respect which his habitual reverence for godly men has drawn forth. But it should be remembered, that what a man *thinks* is one thing, and what a man *believes* is quite another thing; that thought has the *mind* for its region of exercise, and belief is an act of the *spirit*—the highest faculty of man. And if, in judging of the fathers, we would make this needful distinction between matters of *opinion* and matters of *faith*—between what they *thought* and what they *believed*—we think that most of these discrepancies and apparent contradictions would disappear.

We are obliged to speak in this guarded manner, because we can at present do no more than prompt every one whom it concerns to make this examination for himself. To exemplify and substantiate the distinction we have pointed out would require more space and time than would be consistent with our mode of publication. But we are sure that the most glaring of the errors of the Romanists, in the point of doctrine, have arisen from this mistake—they have converted opinions of godly men into articles of faith. And so the famous dictum concerning the faith of the Church, *quod semper, ubique, ab omnibus*, is palpably false when applied to *their* *creed*, which is made up of *opinions* as well as *truth*, but is true when applied to the one faith of the one Catholic Church.

And as faith is laying hold of the truth, and every definition of truth must exclude everything contrary to it, the *semper* of the definition of Catholic faith must apply to *all time*—to the

faith of those holy men who preceded the incarnation, and waited for the promises, as well as to the faith of the Christian Church. As, indeed, St. Paul expressly asserts in two places (Gal. iii. 8; Hebrews iv. 2), and puts in a still stronger form by the definition and exemplifications of faith given in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, where the faith is shown to be one and the same throughout all ages.

Now it is to that which constitutes this grand unity—to that which binds together the faithful of all generations, we would call the attention of our readers. This will save us from being tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine, will deliver us from vain confidence in men on grounds which do not demand confidence, and will deliver us from the still vainer confidence in ourselves, by showing in what respects the company of the faithful and the Church of the first-born are entitled to our confidence, and thus become not only an encouragement, but a guide to our faith.

The faith spoken of by the apostle Paul, as that of the holy men of old, and his own faith, as declared continually in all his epistles, have this point in common—they all rest immediately upon God; they suffer nothing to intervene—no man, or thoughts of man, not even their own thoughts of probabilities or possibilities, which might clog or hinder faith; they believe without hesitation—they “take God at his word.”

It was by *mere* faith in the declaration of God that they were assured of the creation, not by any process of reasoning or deduction. “Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God.” And faith in the promise of God led Abraham to expect seeming impossibilities, things contrary to all reason and experience, in the birth and in the sacrifice of his son Isaac. And it is not saying enough of this faith to say that it precedes reasoning, and may believe seeming impossibilities, for it has nothing to do with reason or the mind of man; it lies in a higher region—it is the spirit in man wrought upon by God, who is a Spirit, and knowing him, believing whatsoever he has revealed.

And all the objects of faith are matter of mere revelation, ministered from God to man, in order that man may know, adore, and serve his Maker, and so become truly what it was said at his creation that he should be, the image of God. Therefore revelation begins with making God known—God himself; and therefore faith, “the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen,” first believes in him; and having laid hold of the revelations concerning himself, perceives all

other things to be but means and materials for more fully making known God in his various attributes, and patiently waits his time for bringing out and developing this purpose.

First in the order, among means and materials, must necessarily be a faithful people—men of faith, to whom God may entrust revelation, knowing that they will preserve it as a sacred deposit; foreseeing that thus only the knowledge of the true God could be preserved in the world, and that thus it should be effectually preserved. The people of Israel were those appointed to this charge under the Mosaic dispensation; and St. Paul, in enumerating their privileges, sets this the first—“Chiefly because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.” (Rom. iii.) And upon the Church, under the Christian dispensation, that charge has devolved; and it is also her chief privilege to guard and make known the revelations of God. To that trust she, notwithstanding her many other failings, has been faithful, as the Jews, notwithstanding their apostasy, were faithful to theirs. They handed down their Scriptures to our fathers, and we have received ours inviolate and entire from the fathers of the Church.

This first and most important purpose which God has in view in providing a faithful people should ever be kept in view by us, and neither be smothered nor shuffled aside by being mixed up with other and secondary purposes, such as our own well-being, or the temporal welfare of mankind. Therefore it is wrong, on the one hand, that the writers of the *Tracts for the Times* should side with the Romanists in overlaying the revelations of God with traditions and doctrines of men; and it is wrong, on the other hand, that Mr. Goode should make void this the first office of a Church, and which only a Church can fulfil, by supposing that each individual who believes can, for and of himself, discern, retain, and transmit the revelations of God pure and entire. Nay, we go further, and say, that adequately to translate the Scriptures, when they are thus faithfully preserved, requires a body of faithful men, that is, a Church. And we believe our own version derives its peculiar excellence from its having been set about as a *Church work*, and its having received the final sanction of a Church.

And now we come to the distinction between faith and doctrine. A faithful Church, the guardians of the revelations of God, necessarily know Him the revealer—Him who is known by faith, and is both the giver and subject of revelation. And such a people have, therefore, the substance and reality of all faith—have that which, when drawn out and put into the forms of the mind, becomes doctrine. For instance, the highest and most

important of all doctrines are those concerning the Trinity ; but the reality of the one God subsisting in three Persons, and the relation of these Persons to each other, and to the Church, were known and believed by the faithful before the word Trinity was heard of, before any controversy arose upon these points, and before the true doctrine was fully declared by the Church : the true faith was held really, though implicitly, which was afterwards put out formally and explicitly as doctrine. And before, and pending controversy on any points of faith, it is quite possible that *individuals* may hold the true faith, and yet so express themselves as to convey false doctrine, because the expression is a mental operation, and therefore liable to the mistakes and infirmities common to men. But God has promised to be with his Church, and to guide her into all truth, and in this promise we have a safeguard against the truth being lost in consequence of the infallibility of individuals ; and those who do not recognize a Church do thereby cut themselves off from the larger and more important portion of the promises of God, which are made to a collective body—to a Church, and not to isolated individuals. And in proportion to the strength of our faith in God, will be our faith in his promises to the Church, and consequently of our being guided aright and kept in the truth ; and then faith and doctrine will be found in perfect agreement, and we shall keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace ; “being one body ; having one spirit ; called in one hope of our calling ; acknowledging one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all.” (Eph. iv. 4).

Moreover, we should remember that the Church is not a mere passive, inert depository of the truth, but is required to be a living witness for it, and full of zeal and activity in making it known unto others. And, to qualify her for this work, especial grace is given, in answer to the prayers of faith, that she may both understand and do the work committed unto her. Thus St. Paul prays for the Church at Ephesus, that God may give unto them the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him, *after* he had heard of their *faith* in the Lord Jesus, and *love* unto all the saints. (Eph. i. 15, 17). And upon the clergy, more peculiarly, is this grace bestowed, according to the purport and intent of ordination, which betokens not only that they are set apart to the sole duty of being thenceforward ambassadors for Christ, not only that they receive commission and authority to preach the Gospel, but also that in the laying on of hands they might expect grace and ability to discharge the high responsibility resting upon them. Therefore it is that St. Paul

puts Timothy in remembrance that he stir up the gift of God which he had received by the imposition of hands. And therefore it is that we pray continually to the God who alone worketh such great marvels, that he may "send down upon our bishops and curates, and all congregations committed to their charge, the healthful spirit of his grace;" for without this the clergy would stand on no higher ground, and with no better qualification, than a layman of an equally cultivated mind.

We perhaps ought to apologize for insisting thus much upon what may appear so very incontrovertible, so like mere truisms to many of our readers; but we happen to know that these obvious distinctions between faith and reason, and the scriptural characteristics and duties of the Church, are greatly overlooked and slighted in the present day; and Mr. Goode's book really calls for some such remarks. He says (p. 521), "I know not what faith can be but an assent of the mind upon that rational evidence which excludes doubt." So that a man's faith would depend upon the perfection of his reasoning powers, which is notoriously untrue, some of the greatest sceptics having been among the men of most cultivated mind. Faith is trust in the word of another, because we know that other to be trustworthy. This declaration of Mr. Goode is made in commenting upon an extract from one of the Tracts, which is very absurd; but with the absurdity there is some truth, and Mr. Goode has not discriminated between the two. The writer has been saying that love is the parent of faith, and asks, "Why should not the Church be divine?.....I will accept her doctrines, and her rites, and her Bible.....It is, I feel, God's will that I should do so; and besides, I love these her possessions. I love her Bible, her doctrines, and her rites, and therefore I believe." On which Mr. Goode remarks, "If this is not the *ne plus ultra* of enthusiasm, where can we find it?" (p. 513). And the writer might reply, that, if the charge be true, he will be an enthusiast in good company, for that he found similar enthusiasm in the Psalms of David: "O, how I love thy law; it is my meditation all the day"—"Thy testimonies have I taken as an heritage for ever; for they are the rejoicing of my heart."

We regret exceedingly this low standing, not only on account of the book, but much more for the truth's sake. A Low Churchman is not a fair match for the writers of the Tracts; he does not come up to their mark—he has not weapons of the same power—he scarcely comes within arm's length of them. And a Low Churchman does really often misapprehend their point, and so is generally greatly undervalued, if not despised, by them, and fails to do them good; and is also not so serviceable to en-

quirers as he might be, if he fully apprehended and fairly answered the several points. But, notwithstanding this drawback, Mr. Goode's is a very valuable book, and ought to be in the hands of every one who would examine both sides of the question. Mr. Goode's own observations are often very important, and the extracts are numerous and full, forming a counterpoise to some of the *catena patrum* of the Tracts, and affording means to the reader of forming his own judgment on the several questions. But since this work does not embrace all the points in controversy between the Oxford Tracts and ourselves, we must particularize the contents of these volumes.

The first volume is taken up in showing that "holy Scripture is our sole divinely revealed rule of faith and practice, and sole infallible judge of controversies in religion, and is consequently, in the *credenda* of religion, the sole authority which binds the conscience to belief in what it delivers." The former part of the second volume treats of "the sufficiency and fulness of the divine revelation conveyed to us in the holy Scriptures;" discussing therein the doctrines of apostolical succession and the eucharistic sacrifice, &c., and asserting that "the Scriptures are amply sufficient to teach men all such points;" and the volume concludes with 240 pages of extracts, showing "the doctrine of the fathers on the subject of this work." It is, therefore, a necessary part of the argument, in the first volume, to disprove the authority of tradition as binding the conscience—to deny that any apostolical traditions exist—and to lower the authority of, if not utterly to invalidate, all patristical tradition.

In prosecuting this argument, some remarks are introduced on the meaning of the word *tradition*, which remarks are full of weight and importance, and should be well pondered by all those who are standing upon tradition, or resting their faith, in any case, upon it, lest they should find that they have been resting, in some cases, on a false foundation, and in the revulsion which would arise on discovering this should lose faith altogether. Such a reaction as this has been the ruin of many zealous but incautious men; and when it is found that men who are really learned do sometimes fall into gross mistakes as to the meaning of particular passages, it should make us all cautious in taking the sense which first occurs to us, and willing to hear what is the impression it makes upon others. On this subject Mr. Goode observes, in his preface, concerning the writers of the Tracts—

Almost equally incorrect and fallacious are their references to the early fathers, of whose writings one might suppose, from the language they use, that their knowledge was most accurate and extensive. It may be permitted to say, that the blunder Mr. Newman has made in

the interpretation of a common phrase in a passage of Athanasius, the meaning of that phrase being a turning point in the bearing of many passages with relation to the present controversy, shows a want of acquaintance with the phraseology of the fathers, which ought to make us receive his citations with considerable caution. Nor can I at all account for various other erroneous representations and allegations of passages from the fathers, but upon the supposition that much has been taken on trust from other, and even from Romish, writers. And if the heads of the party are not free from such errors, it is not surprising that there are others among them still more deeply involved in them."

The "blunder" alluded to is pointed out more particularly in page 73, where Mr. Goode shows that Mr. Newman regards the phrase *evangelical tradition* as synonymous with the *tradition of the Church*, in Athan. cont. Apoll. 1, 9, 11, 22. But Mr. Goode rightly argues that the phrase *evangelical tradition*, not only here, but generally, in the writings of the fathers, means *the Gospels*, and that the *Acts and Epistles* were called by them the apostolical tradition, like the division of the Old Testament into the law and the prophets. The use of the phrase in this sense Mr. Goode proves by many citations, similar to the following from Gregory Nyssen: "But the argument from the inspired volume, upon the point in question, each one may gather abundantly from both Testaments; for many may easily be found in the prophets and the law, and many both in the evangelical and apostolical traditions." "Indeed (says Mr. Goode), I would ask Mr. Newman where he can find the phrase used in the early fathers to mean anything else" than the written word?

Mr. Goode notices the different senses in which the word tradition is used; and as it is applied to anything handed down in the Church, whether by writing or orally, and also indifferently to traditions from the apostles and from the fathers, he thinks that it would obviate much confusion if the word tradition was used in its proper meaning, and an epithet affixed to it denoting the acknowledged author. And he shows that Basil, and some of the fathers, did so use the term—calling the Scriptures of the apostles apostolical tradition, and the writings of the fathers patristical tradition, or the tradition of the fathers. And he observes, that granting there were traditions of the apostles not contained in Scripture, but orally received by the first generation of the Church, yet the tradition to us is not oral—it is but the written tradition of those who had received it orally, and stands on the same footing with their other writings, and should be considered as patristical tradition, rather than apostolical tradition. "The oral tradition of the apostles, *strictly speaking*, was enjoyed by those only to whom it was actually delivered by

the apostles. *We* can only have the *report* of that tradition made by others; and to call that report by a name that strictly belongs only to Scripture—*apostolical tradition*—necessarily creates confusion; for, in the one case, it applies to the acknowledged words of the apostles, and, in the other, to the report made by others of their substance; and moreover assumes what is questioned, viz., that the report is indubitably correct.”

And concerning patristical tradition itself, Mr. Goode would—

“Draw a wide distinction between the value of the testimony of the fathers as to doctrines, and the oral teaching of the apostles, and their testimony as to those matters of fact that came under their immediate cognizance. It is important to keep this in view, because the value of human testimony is very different in one of those cases to what it is in the other. The value of a man’s testimony *to a fact that takes place under his own eye, or to a matter that is the object of the senses*, is very different to that of his report of an oral statement, especially with respect to matters of doctrine. And this is a truth so obvious and generally acknowledged, that the report of a communication from another, relating even to a matter of fact, would not be received in a court of justice: so conscious are men of the uncertainties attending such evidence. How much more uncertainty, then, attends the reports of communications of this nature, when relating to such matters as the abstruse and controverted points of Christian doctrine..... We draw, therefore, a wide distinction between the value of patristical testimony as to ritual matters and such points, and its value in certifying us as to the oral teaching of the apostles, or of the whole primitive Church; not to dwell here upon the fact that we have but little *direct* testimony as to what that teaching was. Thus the testimony of a few reputable authors may be sufficient to prove the fact of the practice of infant baptism in the primitive Church, but not to prove what the doctrine of the apostles or the whole primitive Church was as to the nature and effects of that sacrament.”

Mr. Goode can scarcely be aware of the way in which this would be answered by both parties. The Oxford man might say that he maintains the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church for the preservation of *all truth*, and therefore deny the distinction; and the Baptist might say, the practice of infant baptism is, by your own confession, not scriptural, *only patristical tradition*, and therefore an unwarranted innovation of uninspired men.

The next great point insisted on by Mr. Goode is, that the doctrine of the Tracts is identical with that of Rome—a point made out by him in the sense in which he means the assertion to be understood. But the Tractators differ from the Romanists in not being consistent in their doctrines, and differ widely in motive and intent, being certainly honest men, and not at all conscious whither their doctrines will lead them.

The next great point handled by Mr. Goode concerns the ancient creeds, and more especially that which we call the Apostles' Creed. And on this we have no other remark to make than coincidence, especially according to the tenor of the Bishop of Lincoln's words, which are quoted with approval by Mr. Goode (p. 28): "The inference to be drawn from Tertulian's writings is, that the Apostles' Creed, in its present form, was not known to him as a summary of faith; but that the various clauses of which it is composed were generally received as articles of faith by orthodox Christians."

And then comes the longest and most important chapter of the volume, extending through three hundred pages, and arguing, under various sections, that patristical tradition is no divine informant. This opens ample matter for comment, which, if we were to prosecute as sedulously as we are inclined, might extend our review to another three hundred pages. In this long chapter many most excellent things are said; and it is evident throughout that the writer is a most sincere, zealous, candid man, and a man of great learning and research; and that these estimable qualities are only prevented from having their full development by the narrowing, individualizing system to which we have already referred, and which is one of the evil consequences and perversions of the important truth contended for by our Reformers—the right of private judgment. And it is evident that the system does not sit well on such a person as this, and that there are express breakings out every now and then which indicate an instinctive craving for greater catholicity than the Low Church system will admit of, and a very near approach to all that we could wish. But the enlargement can only come in the way of faith, not in the way of reason; it will not be attained by searching for correspondences between his own creed and that of other men, but by believing that the grace of God, which has brought him to believe the truth, is causing others to believe by the same grace. He is himself an evidence that God has not forsaken the Church: let him have faith for others of that which he knows in himself. In the days of the apostle Paul there was still more reason than there is at present for entertaining the same apprehension, that God had cast away his people; and the apostle meets it precisely in the way we are speaking of. "I say, then, hath God cast away his people? God forbid. *For I also am an Israelite.....* God hath not cast away his people whom he foreknew:" and corroborates the argument, both as to faith and the foreknowledge of God, by referring to the similar case of Elijah, who deemed that he alone was left a

servant of the Lord, when there were in the land many thousands who were still steadfast with their God.

And really, in faith, and at *heart*, Mr. Goode is at one with us, notwithstanding his reasonings and the workings of *his mind*, which might induce the supposition of an irreconcilable difference. Nay he is really much nearer being at one with the Romanists and the Tractarians in the unity for which we contend than he himself supposes; he is not far from spiritual unity—the unity of faith in those great truths of revelation in which both Romanists and Tractarians make their last and only impregnable stand, after they have been driven out of all their ambushments and hiding-places, at best devices of men, often mere refuges of lies. For what says Mr. Goode himself on the turning point of the whole question? He quotes with approbation Bishop Morley's words, which are these:—

“If by the word Church were meant *all Christians in all places*, he would willingly grant that the Church, in that sense, did never, nor could never, err in any point of faith or manners absolutely necessary to salvation.” “And this (says Mr. Goode) might be granted for the *present* as much as for the *ancient* Church. And it is remarkable (says Mr. Goode) that Bellarmine himself, when driven to an explanation of what is meant by the infallibility of the Church, states it thus—‘The Church cannot err; *that is*, that which *all* believers hold as of the faith is necessarily true and of the faith;’ respecting which (says Mr. Goode) there cannot be two opinions among those who suppose that there has always been a succession of individuals in the Church holding the true faith. And when he (Bellarmine) adds—‘and likewise that which *all* bishops teach as belonging to the faith, is necessarily true and of the faith,’ we (says Mr. Goode) should not, perhaps, think it worth while to raise much dispute on the abstract question. So far (says Mr. Goode) we fully agree with our opponents. Only let them prove anything by Vincent's rule, and we will most willingly accept it.” (Vol. i. 169, 170.)

If this be so, what becomes of Mr. Goode's assertion (p. 521) “I know not what faith can be but an assent of the mind upon that rational evidence which excludes doubt?” And is it not evident that the same words are used in one sense by those quoted, and convey a different sense to Mr. Goode? They are speaking of *faith*, the gift of God, and indicative of his presence, and of a company whose faith we are exhorted in Scripture *to follow*. They are speaking of *authoritative* teaching, received *in faith*, as from those empowered of God to declare the truth. Mr. Goode is rather looking to the number of believers as another item in that *rational evidence* which excludes doubt, and to the teaching of bishops, as being,

from their learning, experience, and station, more influential upon the mind—a more cogent kind of persuasion.

And we may endeavour to illustrate the kind of proof which, according to the rule of Vincent, might be adduced, by referring again to the observation of the Bishop of Lincoln, respecting the Apostles' Creed and the faith of the primitive Church. His lordship found, from a comparison of different passages scattered through the writings of Tertullian, that the various clauses of which that creed is composed were generally received as articles of faith by orthodox Christians, though the creed, in its present form, was not known to him as a summary of faith. What the Bishop of Lincoln found in the writings of Tertullian, others may find in the writings of the rest of the fathers—viz., articles of faith generally received by orthodox Christians antecedent to the putting these articles into the form of summaries of faith, and quite distinct from mental ratiocination of any kind.

The bishop rightly calls the creed a summary of faith—that is, it is not faith, not a ground of faith, or source of faith, but a summary, a brief account or recapitulation of *already existing* faith. And although this summary is a *perfectly correct* one, and therefore corresponds with the faith, it is easy to conceive the possibility of such a summary being an *incorrect* account of the faith of the Church, if, from the *mental deficiencies* of the writer, *improper expressions* are introduced. And this is really the case with many of the fathers; they give an incorrect report of the faith of the Church, from using expressions which, *if we understand them aright*, do not accurately convey the faith of the Church, and the meaning of which needs to be elucidated or qualified by other passages in their own writings, or the writings of their contemporaries.

And it is manifest that the articles of faith spoken of by the Bishop of Lincoln are the great eternal verities of the Christian religion, which came not from man, and received no addition from the mind of man—truths which only God could reveal, which we receive without thought or question, as coming from him, which were given entire and complete to the Church at the beginning, and which shall abide with the Church as long as there is a Church upon the earth. And most of these truths are so stupendous, as not only to be above the reach of man to invent, but beyond the reach of man to comprehend *mentally*, after they are revealed. And many of the discrepancies in the fathers are occasioned by the folly of endeavouring to bring into the region of thought and understanding things which belong to the region of faith—endeavouring to comprehend the incom-

prehensible God, instead of receiving what he reveals in simple faith, as was especially the case with such men as Origen.

In what we are now stating, Mr. Goode is again nearly agreed with us at heart, although it makes against his whole system. For he says of the fathers (p. 275)—

“As it respects many of the passages quoted against them, though the words may be different to those which were afterwards used on the subject, and the expressions be even such as were afterwards carefully avoided by the orthodox, when it was found how they were wrested by heretics to an unorthodox meaning, yet the meaning of those who used them must be judged of by their general doctrine on the subject. And further, with respect to many others, there is a misunderstanding in the case, arising from men not fully comprehending the true nature of the orthodox doctrine.”

And even towards the doctrine of Catholic consent, against which Mr. Goode stoutly contends, there is a considerable approximation in such passages as these—

“It is quite true that these fathers may have held, and probably did hold, that there had been in the Church a succession of those who had delivered the true doctrine. And so do we. And hence it is that we admit the principle, that if you take all the remains of the primitive Church for the first few centuries, you will find among them a correct statement of the true orthodox doctrine in all fundamental and important points. And thus those writings constitute an useful practical check against the inroads of error, of Popish novelties, and fanatical conceits.” (p. 283).

But then he immediately neutralizes it by saying—

“There is hardly one, perhaps not one, single point of doctrine now controverted, in which an adversary of the orthodox doctrine could not bring forward some *plausible* patristical evidence in his favour.”

How, then, can we know which is in the right? What decides doctrine to be *orthodox*? We apprehend that many of the points included in the phrase “orthodox doctrine” are not touched upon in Scripture. And Mr. Goode knows full well that heretics do appeal to Scripture as well as to patristical tradition. After all, then, the determination of this most important question, as to what constitutes orthodox doctrine, is to be left to the single, unassisted discernment of each individual! This is indeed to make a pope, in the worst sense, of each individual; and would be found a sorry foundation for orthodox doctrine—a broken reed, instead of a quiet resting-place.

It is remarkable that the doctrine for which Mr. Goode finds the most unanimous testimony in the records which remain of the first centuries should be the doctrine of the Millennium:—

“It is confidently delivered to us by the principal fathers of the first

two centuries and a half, uncontradicted by the others we possess of that period, that the apostles affirmed that at Christ's second coming there should be a resurrection of the just to a life of joy and happiness upon earth, where they should live with Christ for a thousand years, previous to the general resurrection and the final judgment." "It is impossible to deny that the testimony in favour of this doctrine, as an apostolical tradition, is such as can be adduced for hardly any other; and by the earliest fathers it is delivered to us as one which it savours strongly of heresy to deny. They deliver it to us as the undeniable sense of Scripture, and as confirmed by a testimony coming to them by successional delivery from the oral teaching of the apostles." (313, 321).

Concerning the truth or falsehood of this doctrine Mr. Goode expresses no opinion; *his* argument does not require it. But he justly charges Mr. Newman with inconsistency with the principles of the Oxford Tracts, in getting over this difficulty by assuming that "the early opinions concerning the Millennium probably, in no slight degree, originated in a misunderstanding of Scripture;" for *Mr. Newman's argument* does require solution of the difficulty, and the "*probably*" assumed by him shakes *his* whole system to the very foundation. We notice the difficulty merely to say that, on the principles which we maintain, it is capable of an easy explanation; but this is not the place to give it, as we are now only endeavouring to arbitrate between contending systems—not explaining our own.

This point of early testimony, and innumerable other and similar points, cannot be explained upon the principles of the Oxford Tracts, or of Mr. Goode. But it is not for the sake of explaining difficulties—it is not to form a consistent system—it is not for satisfaction to the intellect that we are contending, but because we believe that the very existence of the Church and the salvation of men are in peril. Factions are multiplying and breaches are widening in the very heart of the Church; and fear, and the pit, and the snare are all around. Men, having no firm principles to rest upon, are hurried hither and thither by their fears, and those who escape falling into the pit of infidelity are in danger of being caught in the snare of the Papacy.

We believe there is no security for any but in Church communion, and for such communion a Church must be recognized as a *reality*—as a *body*—as *our own*; as made up, in short, of other selves, with whom we ourselves are as one in all things. A company who are acting together, and agree in superficial and ordinary things, but disagree in the most important things—the things of eternity—is no Church. And unless we feel what is the standing of a Church *in the sight of God*, we shall not feel our responsibilities, qualify ourselves to fulfil them,

nor do our duty towards God or towards men. The Church is a mighty instrument in the hand of God for accomplishing purposes which men, standing singly, cannot effect. And isolated individuals, having no inherent bond of union, and striving to co-operate as a Church, are like a rope of sand; and though the independent atoms were precious as diamonds, instead of worthless as sand, there could be no union without a principle of cohesion, but, on the contrary, it will be "diamond cut diamond."

And we needed not such examples as those afforded by Mr. Spencer and Mr. Sibthorp, to warn us of the danger of men's rushing from one extreme to the other; it is in the nature of things. When men know not the true nature of a Church, and grow not into their true place by seeing it as a whole in its true proportions, and finding those around them growing with them, they must by any growth become like excrescences, foreign to the body with which they have been in contact, and either cast themselves out or be shaken off. And the whole evangelical party are every one of them in great danger of following the evil example of Mr. Spencer and Mr. Sibthorp, if placed in similar circumstances, and assailed by so mighty an engine as the Papacy.

For Rome, having the machinery and the unity of a Church, has an energy and a power which no single individual standing in his own strength alone can withstand, even although he should begin the contest under the conviction that the energy and power is put forth on the side of evil. How else is it that Rome is so notoriously increasing, and among men who read their Bibles, and who have belonged to evangelical congregations—nay, who have even been themselves the instructors and spiritual guides of such congregations? Rome is truly a Church, but a corrupt Church, and putting forth the powers of a Church for evil. We would desire to see the whole Church of England stirring itself from indifference in this matter, putting aside party divisions, and laying hold of the powers and energies of a Church which are within her reach, that they may be used not only for her defence, but be put forth in the cause of truth.

Towards Mr. Goode we have no feelings but those of respect; we have derived much pleasure and instruction from the perusal of his works, and could adopt many long passages without qualification as representing the sentiments we also hold; and, if we have less spoken of these, and more of those passages from which we differ, it has been in the desire and hope that Mr. Goode may reconsider these points, and, by enlarging his principles, become still more extensively serviceable to the Church than he has already been. And it has been our privilege to

know many who belong to that party called Evangelical in the Church; and we desire to bear testimony to their exemplary holiness, diligence, and charity—they are, as individuals, entitled to every commendation. But our lot is cast in times when there is a warfare of *principles*, rather than of individuals; and these often openly and avowedly contending for the mastery, but still more frequently working insidiously and secretly: so that men of opposite principles shall “agree to differ,” as it is called. And living and acting together, in seeming harmony, while conscious that their principles are opposite, what is the result? At best, that the principles of both are weakened or destroyed, by being kept in abeyance, and treated as an indifferent thing; but more commonly, that the evil principle has at length the mastery, and works the more surely from working thus insidiously.

And of all the evil principles with which we are now assailed and tempted, those which hold out to us the promise of independence, and flatter us into the belief that each man has the ability to discern, choose, and act for and of himself, are the most dangerous. They are the largest class at the present time, and they chime in most entirely with the natural self-sufficiency of fallen man. Against this principle of independence, which was the temptation that led to the fall, the word of God is most strongly set from the beginning, and against it the Church has had the greatest difficulty in contending. But it is manifest that where this principle prevails there can be no Church, the very meaning of a Church implying deference to each other, and the deference of all to authority. The deference of children to a parent is the scriptural comparison; that like as children do not regard their parents as equals, whose opinions they may as well hear, and may adopt or reject at pleasure, but regard their parents as their superiors, entitled to reverence for their superior wisdom, and deference from the authority with which God has invested them; so the children of God should regard the Church. And it was a master-stroke of Satan in the Papacy that this necessary constitution of a Church should have been so perverted to tyranny and thralldom of every kind that neither God nor man could endure the bondage; and we, galled and fretted by that loathsome and cruel yoke, not only abhor the most distant approach to such another slavery, but lie open to the suggestions of Satan, that *any* deference to authority in the Church may be the first step towards a renewal of the thralldom; and, succeeding in this, he can keep us as independent of all good as he ever desires. There is no question, it is beyond dispute, that the Papacy abused the authority of the Church; but

we have to get rid of the abuse, not of the thing itself. The Scribes and Pharisees had abused their authority, and were denounced by our Lord, in woes manifold, as blind guides, hypocrites, a generation of serpents, and children of the devil. But our Lord took not away the authority which they legitimately had, as sitting in Moses's seat—an instance which we the rather refer to, because Mr. Goode has most certainly misunderstood it in his comment on the passage.

The Church is set to be an example to the world in all things. This *practical teaching* God requires at her hands as well as sound doctrine ; and especially should she testify, by her contrary practice, against any evil which is peculiarly prevalent at the time. The evil of these days, in all departments of life, is insubordination—children rebelling against parents, subjects against rulers, and all men fancying themselves competent to instruct those from whom they ought to learn, and call in question those whom they ought to obey. At this time, pre-eminently, the Church should consider it her duty to set an example of subordination in all respects, and especially of reverence for those who are over them in the Lord, pondering well the Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, and the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude : in which portions of Scripture the evils of insubordination, and the corresponding duty of the Church, are more particularly pointed out.

And the Church can ill afford to dispense with any portion of the service which may be rendered, or the example which may be shown, by such right-hearted and well-informed members of her communion as Mr. Goode. And greatly shall we rejoice if any of the observations which we have made should induce one, who is evidently so reverent and orderly in his spirit, to follow altogether its leadings, so as not to be scared by Papal despotism and superstition to the rejection of the authority given to the Church, and the certainty ascribed to faith in the Scriptures.

If the controversies which now rage so fiercely—seeming at present to produce only discord, and threatening us with positive and irremediable evils—should, in their progress, open to the conviction of the contending parties truths, held by their antagonists, of which they had been reciprocally ignorant, and so produce in all mutual forbearance, diffidence of themselves, and charity towards others, these controversies may lead to an enlargement of faith, and real Christian unity, such as the world has never yet seen. That they may be so overruled of our heavenly Father, we fervently hope, and would humbly and heartily pray.

ART. VI.—*Luther : a Poem.* By the Rev. ROBERT MONTGOMERY, M.A., of Lincoln College, Oxford. London : Baisler. 1842.

ALAS! that there should be so little activity in the Church, save that which is exhibited in support of party ! It is now, and has long been acknowledged, and acknowledged with the deepest regret, that when the stimulus of party spirit is withdrawn, the energy of Christian exertion languishes, and it seems as though no end were to be gained by it. The Church Missionary Society and the Pastoral Aid Society flourished more than the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Additional Curates Society, because it was distinctly understood that the one appealed to a party within the Church, and the other did not. We say this without any feeling of ill-will towards the societies in question, and we rejoice to know that one of them has cast off the badge of party ; but it remains to be seen whether the elements of its former activity will remain in the Church Missionary Society, now that it is a quiet and unobtrusive part of our great Church system. Our belief is that they will—that a crisis has arrived in the history of our Church when men of sound minds and competent learning are awakened to the responsibilities they have incurred. They feel that they must arise and be doing—that they must lift up their voices against the errors of Geneva and the errors of Oxford. Let us rather say that they must join their voices to those of Faber and Townsend, and show that Oxford, so long the seat of sound learning, is not, in these last days, to be compromised by the heresy of some few among her sons.

We make these remarks, because we feel that every day the symptoms of the crisis of which we have spoken are growing stronger. The press, which has for years been silent, save when speaking the language of Tractarianism, or semi-Dissent (for no milder term can we fairly apply to the Baptist Noel school), is now sending forth, from time to time, works which, like the trumpet note before battle, announce the gathering together of armies—works which forcibly call the attention of good men to the opinions and teachings of our own Reformers—works which remind us of the better age of our divinity, when Hooker wrote and Taylor preached, and when science, and literature, and philosophy, and poetry waited, as obedient handmaids, upon Christ's bride, the Church, and adorned her for the love and admiration of men. We begin to see the dawn of such a day, of which we also are to be partakers. Among us the heralds of such a state have made their appearance, and we hail their coming as the

harbingers of a better age. The fathers of the early Church are studied—the Reformers of our own branch are valued—the individual opinions of men are less trusted—and thus the true spirit of Popery is gradually declining among us, even while the Roman Church is apparently making progress.

Among the causes which have led to this desirable result, we rank in no backward place the publication of the *Tracts for the Times*. We do not retract one word of the grave, but, we trust, Christian censure which we have passed upon their contents. Our opinion of their authors remains utterly unchanged, but we yet rejoice that they have appeared, because the good which they have been instrumental in effecting will we believe, by God's blessing, remain, while the evil they have caused will disappear, and that speedily. It is not by the perversion of such men as Mr. Sibthorp, or Mr. Wackerbarth, that a serious blow can be inflicted on the Anglican Church—they are better without than within; nor will they do their new allies any good. But to have set the whole Anglican communion on the search into Christian antiquities is a service which, by its very nature, will overthrow the errors of the Tractarians: and that service they have rendered us. And here we will record our conviction—a conviction based on a diligent reading of the Tracts, and similar works by the same authors—that the heads of the school are by no means well versed in the patristic writings—that they would not, and do not, claim any such character for themselves—and that the attributing of such learning to them, by their disciples (who know still less about the matter), is a marvellous piece of impudence. They are well read in the *indices* and *tables of contents* of patristic tomes—they are versed in Roman Catholic theology far more than Protestants in general, but even here not to be compared with such men as Dr. Wiseman; but we unhesitatingly declare, and we could substantiate our declaration by proofs, that they are not *very learned* in the fathers, and they know *almost nothing* about the Reformers.

In the first article of our last number we took up the question of the English Reformation, brought, as it was, under our notice by the seasonable appearance of the two first volumes published by the Parker Society. We shall now go on to consider the state of the continent at the same period, and this will dispose of several other points at issue between us and the Tract writers on the one hand, and the semi-Dissenters on the other. The publication of Mr. Montgomery's splendid poem, with its admirable preface, furnishes us at once with an excellent "peg" whereupon to hang our ideas, and many clear and striking views of the state of religion during the Lutheran period, which we

shall without hesitation transfer to our own pages. It will, therefore, be rather as a theologian, or a theological historian, than as a poet, that we shall look at Mr. Montgomery during the present investigation; and our great object will be, by his help, to give our readers the same kind of glance at the Continental Reformation which in January we did of our own.

So perfectly and completely is Luther, his person, and his character, amalgamated with the German Reformation, that it may almost be said that the life of the man was, so long as it lasted, the life of the principle. It was the gigantic moral strength—the stern, unflinching honesty of the great Reformer, that neither could terror daunt it, nor hope bribe it, nor persecution weary it, which finally gave the death-blow to Papal supremacy. There is yet a Pope and a Vatican. The Papal succession has not yet been broken, but the power of the Papedom has gradually declined; and the states which have adhered to Papal rule have, for the most part, become almost daily less and less mighty; and should we see the day when “Babylon the Great” shall be utterly “fallen, fallen,” we may trace but the effects of that blow inflicted by the poor and friendless Augustine monk.

Europe was but little prepared for the startling truths which Luther unveiled. Here we see the first great difference between those to whom he preached, and those who were addressed by Ridley and Cranmer. It is true that John Huss and Jerome of Prague had denounced the corruptions of Rome, and preached to a great extent the Gospel of truth. We willingly agree with Mr. Montgomery, who, quoting Cowley as follows, states that—

“In all great changes in the world, it usually pleases God to make it appear, by the manner of them, that they are not the effects of human force or policy, but of the divine justice and predestination; and though we see a man like that we call Jack of the Clock-house, striking, as it were, the hour of that fulness of time, yet our reason must needs be convinced that his hand is moved by some secret, and, to us who stand without, invisible direction.”—*Essays*, p. 76.

This we admit; and we are further prepared, also, taking the question out of the philosophical and putting it into the historical point of view, to show that there was some considerable preparation in the period immediately anterior to Luther's own day. Referring to the remarks of Cowley, previously cited, Montgomery adds—

“The spirit of this is eminently applicable to the comparative proportions between the agent and the work of the German Reformation; but still, in our passion for analogies, we may carry ourselves a little beyond the truth; it is well, therefore, to remember, that though

it can only be said in a remote and indirect sense that Luther's mind was at all *formed* by the age in which he appeared, yet had there been slow but certain influences at work, which seasoned the intellect and conscience of mankind for the reception of his truths and doctrines. His own parents had caught the educational feeling that was then beginning to stir the humblest rank ; commerce and wealth were adding to the capacities, both social and political, of the principal towns ; and Pfizer tells us, that ' the imperial cities, of which there were at that time many, became the chief support, and sometimes even the nursery, of the Reformation ; while the ducal cities also asserted their rights, and stood forth as free and independent corporations.' In addition to this we must add, that God had raised up, from time to time, direct witnesses for *the truth*, and doctrinal pioneers, who cried aloud in the Papal wilderness, and helped to make straight a highway for the coming Gospel. Of these we may name the writer of the Sentences, Peter Lombard, who became popular in England, and also helped to educate the reforming spirit of Wickliffe."

We are much pleased with this last sentence. Our author, in thus discriminating between such men as Petrus Lombardus, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas à Kempis (he might also have added Thomas Aquinas), and the sophists of the worst days of school divinity, has proved that he argues from facts, and not from prejudices, and that before *writing* about Luther he *read* about him.

But we are digressing : it is our first object to show that the state of the continent, and more especially the state of Germany, at the time of the Reformation, was far less advantageous for the development of truth than the condition of England during the same period ; and that, consequently, the greater advances made by the latter are to be attributed, under God, to the greater facilities she enjoyed, and not to the faults of the German Reformers. This proposition brings us at once into collision with the Tractarians, who, while they look with great coolness on Cranmer and Latimer, are hardly disposed to allow Luther or Melancthon to have been Christians at all. The first point of variation that will strike us is the very different state of popular belief ;—there was, indeed, a kind of education that was encouraged, nor had secular learning ever more magnificent patrons than the Popes of that period : but as to religious education, so low was it fallen, that the scandalous sale of indulgences would probably have gone on undisturbed had it not been for Luther. The religious works published in the early part of the sixteenth century by the Romanists are resingularly devoid of the spirit of vitality ; and the loose morality which prevailed in the more elegant literature of the day is too well known to need, and too disgusting to admit of, particularization.

We feel ourselves authorized to assert, that notwithstanding the labours of Huss and Jerome—notwithstanding the admiration expressed, and doubtless felt, by some among the learned for the works of Dante, and St. Thomas Aquinas, and Peter the Lombard, and Occam, and Thomas à Kempis, and Albertus Magnus, and many others of the same stamp—notwithstanding the encouragement given by the Medici, and men like them, to arts and science, and philosophy, and elegant literature, that the earlier part of the sixteenth century was hardly to be surpassed in religious darkness by any of the dark ages. Albicus, the Archbishop of Prague, was more than once in danger of death for supporting Huss, and yet the very mob that would have destroyed him knew as much of his real sentiments as the mob which insulted his remains for persecuting Huss. In both cases the parties knew nothing either of the persons or the principles for which they were contending.

Another point of difference will be found in the very different administration of Rome here and on the continent. In England she was obliged to go softly, and to speak with deference to royal authority; for our Edwards and Henrys, though they liked the “successor of Peter” very well, liked their own wills far better—and the spirit of the English nation never permitted this to be a Pope-ridden land. In Germany, on the other hand, divided, as it was, among a multitude of petty princes, each absolute in his own dominion, and all linked together by a very slender thread of allegiance to their common feudal superior, the emperor, it is plain that the Papal authority might be pushed to a height, and the Papal exactions carried to an extent, of which here we can form but a slight idea. The distribution of Church patronage, too, took, from the causes we have mentioned, a character of peculiar corruption. Each small ruler provided for his own electoral, ducal, or princely family, by the large revenues of the German bishoprics; and a kind of tacit league was struck up between the encroachments of Rome, on the one hand, and the simoniacal, or, at all events, worldly disposal of patronage, on the other. Children, yet in the tenderest years of infancy—warriors, grown old in profligacy and armour—statesmen, hoary in dissimulation and intrigue, were made pastors of Christ’s Church, and the laity were told to look on them as sacred.

But, in a theological point of view, the condition of Germany was not so different from ours, though still worse. The first thing to be reformed was *doctrine*; for Rome had so overlaid with her corruptions the fundamental doctrine of Justification by Faith, that *any* further deterioration might be introduced at *any*

time. In Germany she had built a higher superstructure of abominations, had more fully developed the mysteries of iniquity, and more completely "turned aside the poor out of the way;" but in England the foundation of the same superstructure had been laid, the first step had been taken which must inevitably lead to the same results, viz., the obscuration of that great, and, *to us*, fundamental doctrine of our religion, JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH. This doctrine was the key-stone of Luther's system; it is the key-stone of the Gospel; and he who found how widely the Church in his day had departed from the truth, began, and began rightly, by inculcating the necessity of a reformation in DOCTRINE. Ranke well observes—

"To a man like Luther, whose religion was one of inward experience, who was filled with the ideas of sin and justification which had been propounded by German theologians before his time, and confirmed in them by the study of the Scriptures, which he had drunk in with a thirsting heart, nothing in the world could be so shocking as the sale of indulgences. Forgiveness of sins to be had for money, must be the most deeply offensive to him, whose consciousness of the eternal relation between God and man sprang from this very point, and who had learned to understand the Scriptures for himself. He certainly began his opposition to the Church of Rome by denouncing this particular abuse; but the ill-founded and partial resistance which he received led him on step by step. He was not long in discovering the connexion which existed between this monstrous practice and the general corruption of the Church. His was not a nature to quail before the last extremity; he attacked the head of the Church himself with dauntless intrepidity. From the midst of the most devoted adherents and champions of Papacy, the mendicant friars, arose the boldest and most powerful assailants it had ever encountered. *Luther, with singular acuteness and perspicuity, held up to view the principle from which the power originally based upon it had so widely departed; he gave utterance to an universal conviction; his opposition, which had not yet unfolded all those positive results with which it was pregnant, was pleasing to unbelievers, and yet, while it attracted them, satisfied the earnestness of believers: hence his writings produced an incalculable effect; in a moment, Germany and the world were filled with them.*"—*Ranke's History of the Popes*, vol. i. p. 77.

Nor is this all: not only did he begin by a reformation of doctrine, but he *ended* with it; he was, as Mr. Montgomery well remarks, "no mere ecclesiastical Chartist;" he had no designs of rebellion against lawful authority, nor had he the slightest intention of innovating on the order and peace of the Church. When the first news of his "anti-popery" reached Rome, Leo X., who concerned himself very little about theology or theological disputes, and whose private opinion of indulgences, and many another solemn farce, was not much more

elevated than that of Luther, remarked—"Brother Martin is a man of fine genius, and these squabbles are the mere effusions of monastic envy;" but when he thought it necessary to take some other notice of "Brother Martin," Luther addressed the Pope in a letter, which is partly preserved by Du Pin (vol. iii., p. 156), and which has been censured as subserviency:—

"What can I now do? I cannot recall my assertions, and yet I see that I have excited a great prejudice against myself by this publication. I would willingly retire from this conflict, as I am compelled, against my will, to hear the dangerous opinions of mankind, and more especially because I am unlearned and inexperienced, and am too mean for such high affairs, particularly in this golden age, when the number of men of letters daily increases, so that, were Cicero still alive, he would quickly seek a corner in which to hide his head. But necessity impels me to come forward, who am but as a goose among the swans, that I may, in some degree, be reconciled to my opponents, and fulfil the wishes and demands of many of my friends in publishing my thoughts respecting indulgences. Therefore, most holy father, I cast myself at the feet of your highness, and submit myself and all I possess to your disposal. Your highness will do with me according to your pleasure; for to you it belongs to accept or to reject my cause, to pronounce me right or wrong, to give or to take my life. Whatever may be the result, I shall still esteem the voice of your highness the voice of Christ, acting and speaking through you. If I have merited death, I do not refuse to die, 'for the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof;' praised be his name for ever and for ever. Amen."

This part of Luther's life is peculiarly interesting; he appears here laying aside the character of a reformer, and assuming the simpler, but higher one of a Churchman; and if he entertained, as doubtless he did, some dubious feelings as to the infallibility of the pontiff he addressed, it is certain that he considered that, in the momentous questions at issue, the decision of the Pope would be on his side. This he expressly states, and we shall give his own defence of what seems to us to need no apology. (See vol. i. Luth. Op. 1545, Præfatio.)

"There were, however (he says), and are now, others who appear to me to adhere to the Pope on the principles of Epicurus, that is, for the sake of indulging their appetites, when secretly they even deride him, and are as cold as ice if called upon to defend the Papacy. I was never one of these; I was always a sincere believer; I was always earnest in defending the doctrines I professed; I went seriously to work, as one who had a horrible dread of the day of judgment, and who, from his inmost soul, was anxious for salvation.

"You will find, therefore, in my earlier writings, with how much humility, on many occasions, I gave up very considerable points to the Pope which I now detest as blasphemous and abominable in the highest degree. This ~~error~~ my slanderers call **INCONSISTENCY**; but you,

pious reader, will have the kindness to make some allowance on account of the times and my inexperience. I stood absolutely alone at first, and certainly I was very unlearned and very unfit to undertake matters of such vast importance. It was by accident, not willingly or by design, that I fell into these violent disputes : I call God to witness.

“ In the year 1517, when I was a young preacher, and dissuaded the people from purchasing indulgences, telling them they might employ their time much better than in listening to the greedy proclaimers of that scandalous article of sale, I felt assured I should have the Pope on my side ; for he himself, in his public decrees, had condemned the excesses of his agents in that business.

“ My next step was to complain to my own ordinary, and also to the Archbishop of Mentz ; but I knew not at that time that half of the money went to this last mentioned prelate, and the other half to the Pope. The remonstrances of a low, mean, poor brother in Christ had no weight. Thus despised, I published a brief account of the dispute, along with a sermon, in the German language, on the subject of indulgences ; and very soon after I published also explanations of my sentiments, in which, for the honour of the Pope, I contended that the indulgences were not entirely to be condemned, but that real works of charity were of *FAR MORE CONSEQUENCE*.

“ This was to set the world on fire, and disturb the whole order of the universe. At once, and against me single, the whole popedom rose ! ”

This is Luther's own account of the matter, and be it remembered, that if there was one quality which more characterized the mind of the great German Reformer than another, it was honesty. He, therefore, who would pronounce Luther an heretic, must necessarily pledge himself to the very worst corruptions of Rome ; he that would pronounce him a schismatic, is evidently in a state of ignorance by no means creditable as to the nature of schism. All this has, it may be said, no reference to the present state of the reformed communions on the continent ; but if it proves, and we think it does prove, that they were not founded in schism, then may we look upon the guilt of the schism, which certainly did subsequently exist, as *possibly* chargeable upon the other party ; farther investigation will make the possibility probable ; and a minute examination of all the bearings of the case will bring it to certainty. In all this we wish to have it distinctly understood, that we do not at all touch upon the question, whether the reformed communions on the continent are, in the full and proper sense of the word, *CHURCHES*. We decline the question altogether ; it is one which we are not called upon to settle—our Church has not decided it, and the decision would, under present circumstances, answer no good end.

“ It deserves to be particularly noticed, that in the Preface to the

Ordination Services, and in the Article (xxiii.) 'Of Ministering in the Congregation,' our Church has *justified* her own orders, but nothing more. She has not used any language condemnatory of those who differ from her, which it was open to her to have done, had she thought fit; and which, in the case of other errors, she has done. (See Articles vii. xxv. xxviii. xxxi.) And, therefore, we are not at liberty to draw inferences concerning others. Where our Reformers stopped short, we, too, must halt. The rule for our own guidance is made clear by our Church; but corollaries respecting others will be both gratuitous and a departure from our Church's marked moderation."

Thus speaks Mr. Eden,* in his masterly sermon on the apostolicity of the Church of England—a discourse which we would wish to see in the hands of every clergyman, aye, and of every layman of our body; and, as the point here touched upon, viz., the episcopal succession, is, in fact, the cause of the dislike manifested towards Luther and the Lutherans by "our brethren of the traditional school," by reason of its failure among them, it may not be amiss to examine this matter a little more closely, and see how it was viewed by the bishops in the reign of James I.

The following statement, from an authentic historian, is remarkable and instructive. It refers to the consecration, in 1610, of certain men to be Scotch bishops, whose only ordination had been that of the presbytery:—"A question, in the mean time, was moved by Dr. Andrews, Bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the Scottish bishops, who, as he said, 'must be first ordained presbyters, as having received no ordination from a bishop.' The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Bancroft, who was by, maintained 'that there was no necessity, seeing, WHERE THE BISHOPS COULD NOT BE HAD, the ordination given by the presbyters must be esteemed lawful; otherwise that it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed Churches.' This being applauded to by the other bishops, Ely acquiesced: and at the day, and in the place appointed, the three Scottish bishops were consecrated."†

That the English Church was, when the Canons of 1603 were drawn up, viewed as a *part* only of the Universal Church (and that other Churches, therefore, were other parts), is clear from the form of Bidding Prayer, enjoined on the clergy, and found in the fifty-fifth Canon: "Ye shall pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church—that is, for the whole congregation of Christian

* "The National Church of England—Ancient—Apostolical—Pure:" a Sermon, &c. By the Rev. Robert Eden, M.A., Minister of St. Mary's chapel, Lambeth, and late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Second edition. London: Wertheim. 1842.

† "History of Church and State of Scotland." By J. Spotiswoode, Archbishop of St. Andrew's. London, 1677. p. 514.

people dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland." Then follows the direction to pray for King James, &c.

We have in former numbers explained the principle, the evident principle, of such ordinations and consecrations, and shall not therefore devote any further space to it here. We adduce it to show how difficult is the question, and how different have been the judgments of great, good, and learned men concerning it. We shall make one more extract from Mr. Eden on this topic, and we would entreat our readers to examine his position attentively—weigh *every* word, and ponder the full meaning of every qualification with which he guards his statement. Mr. Eden is not one of those presumptuously ignorant men who trust to themselves that they are "*evangelical*," and despise others; but a learned, sound, evangelical High Churchman:—

"Nothing can be more undoubtedly true than that the clergy of the English Church have the 'apostolical succession,' if by that assertion it be meant that they have been appointed by the recognized officers of a Christian society, whose government is constructed upon the *model of the apostles*. But if it be meant that there is some *secret efficacious power*, that has been handed down from the apostles' times, through a certain series of ministers, in an uninterrupted line, so that, wherever there is room to doubt of the continuity of the line (assuming that the line was not broken by contempt, but by unavoidable circumstances), all the acts of such a ministry shall have been brought into peril of being pronounced invalid—such a view of 'apostolical succession' must be regarded as utterly superstitious."

The recent visit of the chief Protestant Sovereign of Continental Europe to our shores—his communications with the governing heads of our own Church—the relation into which he entered towards one who will be, we hope, though at a period far distant, the temporal head of that Church—the attempts that have more than once been made to introduce into Christian Prussia the line of the apostolical succession, attempts which we have reason to believe will not always be made in vain—are peculiarly interesting at the present juncture. Bishop Hall, after calling the continental communions "our chaste sisters in Christ," and exhibiting the largest possible degree of Christian charity towards those who differed with himself, speaks thus of episcopacy:—

"And for you, my dearly beloved brethren at home, for Christ's sake, for the Church's sake, for your souls' sake, be exhorted to hold to this holy institution of your blessed Saviour and his unerring apostles, and bless God for episcopacy. Do but cast your eyes a little back, and see what noble instruments of God's glory he hath been pleased to raise up in this very *Church* of ours out of this sacred vocation; what famous ser-

vants of God ; what strong champions of truth, and renowned antagonists of Rome and her superstitions ; what admirable preachers ; what incomparable writers ; yea, what constant and undaunted martyrs and confessors. Neither doubt I but it will please God out of the same rod of Aaron still to raise such blossoms and fruit as shall win Him glory to all eternity. So you are to honour those your reverend pastors, to hate all factious withdrawals from that government which comes nearest of any Church on earth to the apostolical." *

He concludes with one of the strongest passages from the Epistles of Ignatius, already adduced, as a witness to these truths coeval with the apostles themselves. If any doubt the genuineness of these Epistles, the only possible means of evading their force, we can but refer to the unanswered and unanswerable "Vindicæ" of Bishop Pearson.

We pass on now to consider the characters of Luther, and of those who acted with him, with reference, not to our day, but to their own. Nor is it without good cause that Dr. Croly, in his last published work, has compared that era with the era of the apostles. When St. Paul preached, he preached against the corruptions of human nature. Those corruptions were supported by the appliances of wealth and empire, and a flourishing state of the arts and sciences. The world, even in its remotest corners, trembled at the greatness of the Roman name. The prevalence of one language and of one law, of one rule and of one supreme ruler, made way for the promulgation of the Gospel ; and while they seemed to be all in the hands of its enemies, they were destined to show more conspicuously that "the weakness of God is stronger than man." Nor does the parallel fail when applied to the religious state of the vast empire of the Cæsars. The vulgar were sunk in the grossest superstition, the learned lost in utter unbelief. He who declared himself to be

"Parcus Deorum cultor et infrequens,"

gave but in the acknowledgment a description of the fashionable irreligion of his day. When we turn, therefore, from the first to the sixteenth century, we are taking no great leap, save in point of time. The effects of Christianity were, it is true, evident in the improved state of society ; but *those* effects had been wrought in a purer and better age of the Church. And if they had been still to be worked out by the religion of Julius II. and of Leo X., of Politian and Machiavelli, there is reason to fear that pagan Rome might have distanced in the moral race her Christian daughter.

* "Hall on Episcopacy," part 3, p. 9.

At the period of the Reformation three causes coincided to make that effectual which, in the days of Huss and Jerome, had failed : the first of these was the invention of printing ; the second, as Dr. Croly well remarks, the rise of diplomacy as a science ; and the third, the discovery of America. These had produced a general feeling among men that they had a community of interests ; they had encouraged a great intercommunion among nations, and had, at the same time, furnished the means whereby that intercommunion could be carried on ; they had given a new outlet for enterprize and energy, and so left more space for free and temperate discussion ; and, finally, they had awaked the human intellect, which for many years had been slumbering (so far as theology was concerned), to a sense of her powers and her responsibilities.

Such was the juncture when, by the especial providence of God, Satan was permitted to put forth a measure which, like Tract No. 90, "was not only a crime, but a blunder." The absolution of the Church was openly put up to sale, and eternal life was declared attainable on the payment of a certain sum of money. Bad as was the age, dark as were the minds of men, great as was the spread of practical infidelity, the world was not yet prepared for a step like this ; nor was there, indeed, a probability that at any future time such would be the case : for it is self-evident, that when practical unbelief had made such progress as to allow the universality of an acquiescence in such a dogma, there would be no longer any faith in the necessity for a priesthood at all, not to say even of a Church.

And fitted to the crisis was the instrument ; strong, bold, and massy, the mind of Luther stood in splendid contrast with the gathered intellect against him ; he seized with a giant grasp the essence of the truth, and scattered to the right and to the left the flimsy sophistries and the arrogant assumption with which Popery had corrupted it. Nor was the opposition which he offered one which grew weary with the task ; he had called up the spirit of simplicity to combat the false philosophy of the day, and to rouse from the luxurious repose wherein it had fallen the energies of Christian Europe.

It would have been a fine study for one, desirous of knowing the relations borne to each other by persons and events, to have glided into the carved chambers of the Vatican, to have seen the walls covered with costly tapestry designed by the hands of Raphael ; the ceilings painted by Michael Angelo ; the tables covered with plate starred with gems, and rendered still more costly by the magic art of Cellini ; the altars, made rather for ornament than for any sacred purpose ; the recesses filled with books, and the

galleries with pictures—all elegant, all voluptuous, and all GOD-LESS; and then to have seen the graceful presiding deity, declining to read the breviary lest he should spoil his Latin; officiating at mass with his boots fresh splashed from the hunting field; piquing himself upon his solemn delivery, and selling his absolution for what it would fetch; and treating with the most classical contempt the interests of Christ's Catholic Church.

Nor would it have been less instructive to pass away from the carved and gilded abodes of pontifical splendour to the cell and refectory at Erfurt. There, pale with study, and worn down by anxiety for the welfare of that which the splendid Leo hardly believed in at all, namely, his own immortal soul—there, filled with high resolve and unconquerable zeal, with a pure and holy love to the eternal spirits of mankind, sat the arch-reformer, carrying on his indefatigable studies, amidst privations and penances, and self-denials, by the light of an iron lamp fed with coarse oil, in a building whose bare walls testified at once the poverty and the almost asceticism of its tenant; nourished, and barely nourished, on homely food; humble and patient, and though gifted with rare gifts, knowing it not: such was the picture presented by the first page in the annals of the Reformation. These two men typified, if, indeed, they did not embody, the antagonistic principles of their day.

But we have begun this article with the mention of Mr. Montgomery, and all the while we have been reviewing both *his subject* and *his poem*—for he has viewed it in the right light, and treated it on the right grounds. But it can hardly be fair to him for us thus to put his verse into prose, and make him speak our language instead of his own. Take the following picture of Luther's preaching:—

“ So felt the young Reformer, when he rose
 Within thy square, high-fated Wittemberg !
 Where the grey walls of St. Augustine's fane
 Crumble in low decrepitude and dust,
 And from his pulpit, piled with simple planks,
 Blew that loud trumpet of salvation's truth
 Whose echoes yet the heart of empires wake
 To fine pulsations, free as Luther loved !
 Eye, cheek, and brow, with eloquence array'd,
 As though the spirit would incarnate be,
 Or mind intense would burn its dazzling way
 Through shading matter—like a second Paul,
 Flaming with truth, the fearless herald pour'd
 Himself in language o'er the listening hearts
 Around him !—like a mental torrent ran
 The rich discourse, and on that flood of mind

Nearer and nearer to the Lamb's white throne
 The soul was wafted : Christ for man,
 And man for Christ, and God for all he proved,
 And hid *himself* behind the cross he raised."

And now we will apply ourselves to our task as critics, and speak concerning the poetry, as such ; but we will first make our only complaint, and point out the only passage which we look upon as a blot in the book, and that one is not Montgomery's, but an extract among the notes. We allude to the note on pp. 396-398, which must, in the next edition, be expunged.

To praise is pleasant, and we have ample material before us that will well justify the language of encomium. The great vivacity of the author's mind is pourtrayed in every page, we had almost said, in every line, of the poem before us. Mr. Montgomery is peculiarly happy in his nomenclature, and the design of his work afforded him many opportunities of displaying his skill. The poem is not divided into books or cantoes, but into sections of various length, and each having its own title and motto. These titles are singularly significant. Popery he has entitled "The Gospel according to man ;" nor could the most accurate definer give a better meaning, nor are the descriptions less excellent :—

„ But chief to that religiously depraved,
 Self-righteous dream of ever-prompting pride,
 From earth to heaven to work or win its way—
 Adapting Pop'ry, with magnetic art,
 Her necromance of ritual pomp applies.
 A finite Self to infinite transform'd,
 Some Trentine God by moral fiction shaped,
 Is all that passion's creed impure desires.
 And lo ! in Rome the heart's vile canons meet
 Their very echo !—grace and sin conjoined,
 An outer form for inner life prepared,
 A dead religion, where no God remains :
 Here is thy charm, thou Romanistic LIE !
 Self-gain'd salvation forms thy secret force ;
 Hence liturgies to please corruption plann'd ;
 Hence creeds to flatter hope, or bribe a fear,
 And all the pantomime of bows and beads.
 So perfect in pure falsity, thou seemest
 By the GREAT LIAR of the world inspired
 To set the Adam of the sensual mind
 In motion—feeling, so that nothing's felt,
 And working, so that nothing's truly wrought
 As Law proclaims, or holy Love demands ;
 Yet Nature, pleased with self-atonement, dares

Blindly to *merit* what mere grace bestows,
And parts with all things—sin alone except.”

Here we have the very principle of Popery explained and pictured before us. We have all the adjuncts of a faith which is sensual to the higher orders of intellect, and sensual to the ear: appealing to the eye and to the ear, rather than to the heart, and which, while it claims to be mystical, and, indeed, is mystical, yet flatters the truly sensual spirit of human nature—that spirit which refuses to trust God, but must work out for itself, and by its own merit, the merit of salvation. Take another specimen of the same kind:—

“ But thou! imagination's martyr'd fool,
Whose faith is fancy in religion's dress,
Whose shining virtues are but gilded vice
(Seen by the Bible's heart-exploring beam)—
For thee the cup of antichrist is drugg'd
With rapt intoxication's master spells.
Anthems that seem to roll from angel harps,
And silver chants that seraphim might sing;
Paintings, where Beauty's virgin grace,
Divinely mortal, exquisitely smiles;
And lights severe, processions slowly grand,
The cloisters pale, where Pensiveness may roam,
The perfumed incense, with its spiral clouds
Floating to heaven before the vested priests,
Whose robes with sacramental meaning wave—
All these, with churches, where religion stamps
The very stones with symbolizing awe,
Where painted windows by their colours preach
Sermons which strike imagination dumb,
Or melt it in soft martyrdom of sighs—
Here is the weaving of those spells that bind
Millions to darkness in the chains of Rome;
Whose mock religion the Almighty veils,
And each fine essence out of saving truth
Evaporates, in forms that stifle faith,
And from the heart its vital heaven exclude.”

And it is a subject of deep lamentation, not merely that such a Rome still, but that those who are the successors of Rome's most potent, because most Catholic, opponents, should number among them so many admirers and imitators of that which is so eminently Popery. Were it not that the depravity of human nature is well known to us, and that experience makes us daily more and more familiar with the truth so admirably elucidated by Augustine in his “Church Principles,” viz., that the intellect is controlled by the affections, rather than the affections by the

intellect—were it not for this knowledge, we might wonder at men so extensively read, and in some points so profoundly read, as are the Tractarians, not perceiving that their own is altogether a system of *rationalism*. We admit the mistiness, rather than the mystery, which pervades their writings; we feel how their purposely loose phraseology enables them to escape from the meaning of their propositions, and we attribute this, not to any dishonest intention—God forbid!—but to a corresponding mistiness in their own minds; they, and those whose minds are like theirs, love the dim and mysterious for its own sake—they feel, with the feeling of poets, the charmed link which binds them to the Church of past days. The glories of gothic architecture—the solemn strains of ecclesiastical music—the quietude of a cloistered life—the awful responsibilities and dread commission of the priesthood—all these things, which appeal to the fancy or the imagination, through the external senses, are with such men primary, instead of secondary, objects. Fasting and penance are deeds which may be done by human beings by their own natural power. There is something solemn and soothing, to the high-toned mind of the enthusiast, in the idea of securing a reward hereafter by suffering voluntarily now. But this is not Christianity; the Hindûs can do this, and they do it. Christianity requires somewhat more—it requires us to rest in faith, and to acquiesce in the use of means of which we *cannot* perceive the efficacy. It teaches us that when we are admitted, by baptism, within the pale of the visible Church, there is no longer any ordinance that works “*ex opere operato*,” like the working of a spell, or, as the old writers in words full of poetry would say, “by word of power;” but that faith on our side, active, lively faith, is required; and that, however insufficient we may deem this, we can have no *merit* before God. Here, in fact, lies the rationalism of the School—they will not believe that man shall have what he has not deserved; hence the notions of inherent righteousness—of baptismal justification (which, though true in one sense, is not true as the Tractarians hold it); hence the notion they entertain concerning sin after baptism; hence the ideas they promulgate about fasting, and penance, and purgatory, and absolution, and prayers for and to the dead. Remembering of such things, well does Montgomery exclaim—

“Oh! for a Luther to inspire us now!
 Th’ awaking magic of some mind immense,
 To charm the sensual from the nation’s soul;
 Our passions dark, our appetites of dust
 To brighten, or to banish; till the love
 Of whatsoe’er is lofty and divine,

Of whatsoe'er is glorious and august,
The throne of public taste may reascend,
Give life to genius, and a law to thought,
And for the beautiful true homage gain.
Woe to the land ! our days are evil now."

Rationalism is but a phase of that evil of which Popery is another—both put the creature in the place of the Creator, and bind down to earth the affections, which should be set on things above. Nor is it the less dangerous when refined and etherealized, and adopted by men of cultivated minds, and recommended by the ascetic purity of their lives. It may seem strange to place Newman and Neander in the same class; but, while they address themselves to widely different feelings, and to widely different men, they are both doing the same work—"whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Our poet shall go on for us, and show us that this spirit of rationalism, this assimilation to the world, is as much the characteristic of Popery now as it was in the days of Innocent III., who told the fourth Lateran Council that he himself was FORSAN CITRA DEUM SED VALDE ULTRA HOMINEM :—

" But Satan copies, where he cannot change ;
And thus, a parody in Popes contrived,
The Lord forestalling ; thus the fiend has framed
A pageant hollow, where his plot can hide
And act himself beneath the Saviour's name.
For all, and more than Rome *assumes* to be,
By heaven empower'd, in privilege and grace
Imperial, must the Gospel Church have *been*,
If holiness with apostolic light
Her shrines, her altars, and her sacraments,
Her ministers and members all had crown'd ;
Creation's priestess would the Church have proved ;
And from the urim of her spirit roll'd
Pure oracles, from Christ above inspired,
Guiding all hearts to glory, and to God."

But it has been doubtless with merciful as well as with wise designs that the Papacy has been allowed to subsist, even to the present day ; and that, weakened as she is by internal discord, and by the growing spirit of enquiry into Christian antiquity, she is able, even in the times in which we live, to put forth "polypus antennæ," and to give us cause to be watchful, lest we allow Satan, in such guise, to gain the advantage over us.

" Wasted and weeping, in mysterious woe,
Yet Rome is mighty in her magic still.
The ark of ages, in stern glory there,
Like man's eternity, by stone express'd,

Behold her!—fated for terrific doom,
 When deeds by prophets sung shall there arrange
 A destined platform. Well may wand'ers trace,
 In wonder, how august she yet remains—
 With fountains, baths, and famous aqueducts,
 Arches, and catacombs, and hoary shrines;
 While all the genius of dead ages haunts
 Her soil with shadows, and her scene with spells
 That speak, though silent! Past and present meet
 In high communion; and historic dreams
 Her tombs unlock, till all the marble streets
 Move with her heroes, whose eternal minds
 Yet walk the world with intellectual sway,
 Reigning like monarchs on our mental throne,
 Tyrants at once, and teachers of the soul."

This is true as well as beautiful, and, seeing that it is true, the spirit of which Luther was the embodiment should be perpetually awake. We love, and love most deeply, the solemn and the sublime; we would not curtail aught of our simple but magnificent ritual; we would willingly consecrate the highest and the best productions of art to the service of religion. Painting, and poetry, and music, and architecture, and sculpture, and even the minor arts, should join to decorate the temples, and to solemnize the worship of HIM who hath given to man the gifts of genius; but directly we view these, as not merely adjuncts, but symbols—directly we transfer to *them* any part of the sanctity of *that* which they adorn—directly we elevate them from the rank of offerings to that of types, that instant do we pass the line which separates spirituality from rationalism, trench upon the confines of Popery, and incur the danger of losing the substance in that which is not even the shadow.

We must, before we pass to the consideration of the political circumstances of the Reformation, deal with our author as a poet. We have quoted, it is true, his verses, but we have quoted them for their theology rather than for their poetry. The poem is, as we have said, in separate sections; it is, in the words of the writer, "an attempt to reflect in a poetical form, by a series of mental tableaux, some of the prominent features and prevailing expressions in the life, character, and work of the fearless Luther." This plan has its disadvantages as well as its advantages; it gives less scope for description, and more for declamation: hence we find that, compared with Montgomery's other works, the present is more declamatory in its character, and, while viewed as a whole its value is enhanced to the thoughtful reader, it is less quotable; and were it not for

the circumstances of the day, and their connection with the subject of the poem, we should consider it less likely to be popular than some of the author's former productions. There are, however, some very sublime, though far less florid passages than those which it was Mr. Montgomery's wont to entertain his readers withal. What follows is a fine specimen :—

“ Thought cannot think, nor tongue of flesh describe,
What yet is vision'd, that our souls may learn
The consummation of this hour decreed !
But come He must—the Faithful and the True—
To reap the harvest of that holy wrath
By him of Patmos fearfully pourtray'd.—
Oh ! tells he not of that tremendous Word
Whose name is written, but to man unknown,
Whose eye flames lightning, on whose awful head
Were many crowns ; and through the opening heavens,
While paws the white horse his portentous way,
Lo ! how the wavings of that blood-dyed vest
Symbol the Lord himself—a Man of War !
Of these, oh tells he not, the loved St. John,
And writes a *blessed* on the faith that hears,
Believes, and watches, for this end decreed.”

This is the strain which, towards the conclusion, the poem generally adopts, and there are occasionally bursts of powerful poetry, which prove that devotion to severer studies has not weakened the force of genius. We shall make two extracts more before we dismiss the poet, and resume the Churchman. One is a kind of passage of which many splendid instances will occur to the reader of poetry ; it is an invocation, and will bear comparison with any which offer themselves to our memory, save, perhaps, that of Milton—“ But chiefly thou, O Spirit,” &c.

“ Oh ! thou Sempiternal Life,
Breathe o'er this effort, and with force array
Whate'er is feeble ; and with heavenly touch
And tone, their meaning so affect, and fill,
That onward to the inner mind of man,
Or central being, where high conscience holds
Her seat august, and faith's dominion acts—
What truths they carry, may be safely borne
Beyond the heartless, and above the vain
To warp or weaken. Here, beneath the arch
Of midnight, solemn, deep, intensely calm,
Thy presence would I realize ; and lift
Mine awe-struck nature to the heights unseen
Of Essence uncreate—where Thou art third
In Godhead, where the fountain Sire is first—
Second, the filial Word—and All supreme
In One co-equal, co-eternal Three,
The God Tripersonal and True—complete.”

Our other extract shall be one of a patriotic character, and therefore rightly taken from the section entitled—"A Poet's retrospect and a Patriot's conclusion;" and with this we shall finish our remarks on the poetry of Mr. Montgomery's volume—

" Here then, be farewell
To this long strain of meditative truth—
E'en by thy bulwark, O Britannic Isle!
That, with the meekness of maternal love,
Ramparts the home her waves have helped to guard.
Here, in the trance of this untroubled night
Sabbatic, lift we now our hand, and heart,
And eyes, to that Supernal Power of Truth,
Who governs all things, but who guardeth thee,
My country, with a most peculiar love;
That once, as out of Zion peal'd the trump
Of ancient Gospel—hence the battle-voice
Of truth reform'd should ever bravely roll,
And waken echoes, such as Luther's heart
Could welcome—deep as burning Cranmer loved,
Or Ridley o'er his pangs of fire prolonged!"

☛The epithet "burning," as applied to Cranmer, is injudicious, because it seems to refer to the character rather than to the death of that eminent primate; whereas we believe that the poet meant it to apply only to the latter; but Cranmer might, with more truth, be called cool, judicious, candid, discriminating—anything rather than burning. In the second edition let this be altered.

And now that, for some pages, we have discussed the poem, turn we to the life and character of Luther; and we will endeavour to show how the posthumous effects of Luther's preaching were modified by the political circumstances of the time, so that the movement which Luther begun as a doctrinal Reformation, and where he would have stopped, was carried onward till it ended in a separation. That a schism was thus made cannot be denied—but where was the guilt of the schism? Was it in the excommunicated, or the excommunicators? Was it in those who contended for purity of doctrine, or in those who, rather than have such purity of doctrine, thrust out the proposers of it from among them? These are questions which it is not fair to leave unanswered; nor ought we to shelter ourselves behind *generalities*, and refuse to take into our consideration the *particularities* of a case so fraught with difficulties.

We are accustomed here to think so exclusively of the Anglican Reformation, and to compare what *has been* done with what *might have been* done on the continent, that we are apt to reverse the positions of importance occupied by the great characters of the

age. Looking, as we almost universally do, on the station and acknowledged talents of Henry VIII., as placing him first in the front rank of European princes, we allow ourselves to be blinded by our national pride. England, though then a mighty nation, was far from being the chief, either in power or in civilization. Henry, though abundantly conspicuous, both for his ability and the energy of his character, was cut off by the insular position of his empire, from very extensive continental influence. "The foremost man of all the world" in that day, whether we consider the calm, worldly, practical, temporal wisdom which distinguished him—the uncommon advantages of his position—the extent of his territories, or the power of his connections—was Charles V. the emperor. His empire had just become consolidated, and he was enabled to feel that the popedom itself was as much a part of his dominions as the kingdom of Spain. Whatever there was of most rich, both in the east and in the newly-discovered west, flowed at that time with an unbroken stream into his coffers. Francis, his noble-minded enemy, was utterly vanquished—Henry VIII. was out-diplomatized—the Pope was kept in check by alternate hopes and fears—the conclave was entirely under imperial control—the German princes were ruled as well by the moral influence of Frederic the Wise, as by the powerful but subtle mind of Charles himself; and there appeared no check to the power of the emperor, save that which might arise from his own mismanagement.

Had Charles at this juncture embraced the cause of the Reformation (and that he was at first by no means decided we have many proofs), it is impossible to suppose any further continuance to Popery. Rome would still have claimed for her bishop, archbishop, or patriarch, the primacy, and it would probably have been allowed; but it would have been a primacy *inter pares*. But the defection at once of Spain, Germany, England, a great part of Italy, and all the low countries, would have dealt as heavy a blow to the political power of Rome, as the works of Luther did to her apostolic reputation. The age was one in which, too, the requisite reformation would have proceeded with a due regard to Christian antiquity, and *thus* set on foot, would necessarily have had the concurrence and assistance of even pope and cardinals. There had been, even before both pontiffs and members of the sacred college, who had advocated a reform; and had such reform come recommended by imperial authority, and under circumstances such as those wherewith Charles could have enforced it, there can be little doubt as to the result. Among the most important consequences of such a step, would have been the absence of Nonconformity in later times, inasmuch as Nonconformity among us arose, for

the most part, out of conformity to the continental communions; and *Dissent*, different as it is both in aspect and in spirit from the more creditable Nonconformity, is but its natural daughter—ugly, indeed, and illegitimate, but still its daughter.

But this step, Charles, for causes on which we must touch very briefly, declined to take. We have spoken of him as a worldly-wise man; he saw clearly that the Papacy, though no longer in a condition to make emperors wait at its gate bare-footed amidst frost and snow, was yet able, as a good tool in the hands of a skilful workman, to be wielded to good effect: and he felt that its sanction was even then sufficiently valuable, in a political point of view, to render it an act of imprudence too deeply to depress it. His own power was too great for Rome to oppress him, nor did he see any temporal advantage to be gained by aiding the movement, sufficient to counterbalance the aid which even yet the Vatican could afford him. Whatever, however, were his motives, it is certain that he opposed, quietly indeed, but effectually, the *establishment* of the Reformation.

By this means access to orders was closed against all but Romanists; and those who felt that Rome was the mystical Babylon, and that they were commanded to come out of her, had no means of perpetuating amongst themselves an episcopal succession. When the Reformers themselves died off, there were none to take their ecclesiastical places; and thus apostolical order became first undervalued, and then despised. It must not be forgotten, there were parties who felt that some order was necessary in Christ's Church, some government expedient; and these, not having *easy* access to episcopal ordination, and in the warmth of a doctrinal reformation looking upon discipline as a thing of comparatively small importance, established the Presbyterian polity, and, *having done this*, felt themselves bound to defend it. Thus it happened that the continental Protestants naturally associated Popery with Prelacy, or even Episcopacy and Protestantism with Presbyterianism—an idea which their Romanist fellow-countrymen also entertained, and which "our brethren of the Tractarian school" hold to this day.

We might go on, did our space permit us, to detail the consequences of this misapprehension, both abroad and at home. But we shall allude to one only, and it shall be the common but uncharitable error of judging our continental brethren by the same rules which we apply to our own different case. Had Charles V. favoured the Reformation, and placed his subjects in the same position in which Henry VIII. placed his, then might the descendants of the one blame the descendants of the other, if they had not equally improved the same advantages. But this was not the case; and while we are not called upon to

defend the apostolicity of their ministry and the validity of their orders, so neither are we authorized to impugn them.

Thus much is certain, that as Christians rejoicing in a knowledge of the Gospel, and having and holding that great bulwark of righteousness, the doctrine of Justification by Faith, we are bound to give God thanks that he sent Martin Luther into the world—one whom Carlyle, in his wild but strong language, calls “a youth nursed up in wintry whirlwinds, in desolate darkness and difficulty, that he may step forth at last from his stormy Scandinavia, strong as a true man, as a god—a Christian Odin, a right Thor, once more with his thunder-hammer to smite asunder ugly enough *Jöturs* and giant monsters.” *

While, then, we look with thankfulness to God for raising up a champion of the truth like this, we must not forget our national causes of gratitude, that among us the Reformation was carried on in a different manner, and that we, while we enjoy in its highest degree **EVANGELICAL TRUTH**, enjoy also a not inferior measure of **APOSTOLICAL ORDER**.

ART. VII.—*The Zincali ; or, an Account of the Gypsies of Spain.* By GEORGE BORROW. 2 vols. London: John Murray. 1841.

MR. BORROW must be an extraordinary man, and has presented us with an extraordinary book—one of the most interesting we have met with for a long time, and interesting in many points of view. The gypsies are a singular people, and on that account interesting to those who only contemplate them at a respectful and respectable distance ; but Mr. Borrow has had the hardihood to live amongst them, to be reckoned one of themselves, and yet to keep himself uncontaminated thereby, and so to present us with a most minute and faithful, yet impartial picture, of this singular people.

There is no accounting for tastes, and Mr. Borrow tells us that he cannot account for his ; and the gypsies account for it in their own way, by supposing that the soul which at present animates his body formerly tenanted that of a gypsy. He has known them for upwards of twenty years, in various countries, and they never injured a hair of his head, or deprived him of a shred of his raiment ; but he is not deceived as to the motive of their forbearance. They thought him a

* Carlyle's "Hero-Worship," p. 208.

Rom, and on this supposition they hurt him not, their love of the blood being their most distinguishing characteristic..... Whatever they did for the Gospel in Spain, was done in the hope that he whom they conceived to be their brother, had some purpose in view which was to contribute to the profit of the *calés* or gypsies, and to terminate in the confusion and plunder of the *busné*, or gentiles.

Mr. Borrow's first interview with the Spanish gypsies is characteristic of both parties, and shows the entire confidence which they at once reposed in him, and the opportunities which this familiar intercourse has afforded for ascertaining all that can be known of this singular people; who suddenly appeared, at nearly the same time, in all the countries of Europe; who spoke the same language and followed the same course of life everywhere; who continue the same language and customs to the present time; and who are unable to give any rational account of their origin, being bound together by a sort of instinct, rather than by those nobler associations and sympathies which form and cement the attachments of man.

It was in January, 1836, that Mr. Borrow entered Spain, and arrived at Badajoz.

"I was standing at the door of the inn where I had taken up my temporary abode: the weather was gloomy, and rain seemed to be at hand. I was thinking on the state of the country I had just entered, which was involved in bloody anarchy and confusion, and where the ministers of a religion, falsely styled Catholic and Christian, were blowing the trump of war, instead of preaching the love-engendering words of the blessed Gospel. Suddenly, two men, wrapped in long cloaks, came down the narrow and deserted street: they were about to pass, and the face of the nearest was turned towards me. I knew to whom the countenance which he displayed must belong, and I touched him on the arm. The man stopped, and likewise his companion; I said a certain word, to which, after an exclamation of surprise, he responded in the manner I expected. The men were *gitános*, or gypsies, members of that singular family, or race, which has so diffused itself over the face of the civilized globe, and which has preserved, in all lands, more or less of its original customs, and its own peculiar language. After a short conversation the men departed in haste to tell the others that a stranger had arrived, who spoke *Rommany* as well as themselves, who had the face of a *gitáno*, and seemed to be of the *erráte*, or blood. In less than half an hour the street before the inn was filled with the men, women, and children of Egypt. After they had asked an infinity of questions, and felt my hands, face, and clothes, they retired to their own homes." (p. 221).

The two men called upon Mr. Borrow in the evening, and subsequently brought others to see him, with whom many

strange conversations took place. In one of these, with a man named Antonio, the Gypsy says—

“Give me your hand, brother! I should have come to see you before, but I have been to Olivenzas in search of a horse. What I have heard of you has filled me with much desire to know you, and I now see that you can tell me many things which I am ignorant of. I am Zincalo by the four sides. I love our blood, and I hate that of the busnee. Had I my will, I would wash my face every day in the blood of the busnee, for the busnee are only made to be robbed and slaughtered. But I love the caloré, and I love to hear of the things of the caloré, especially from those of foreign lands; for the caloré of foreign lands know more than we of Spain, and more resemble our fathers of old.”

Mr. Borrow.—“Have you ever met before with caloré who were not Spaniards?”

Antonio.—“I will tell you, brother. I served as a soldier in the war of the Independence against the French. War, it is true, is not the proper occupation of a gitáno, but those were strange times, and all those who could bear arms were compelled to go forth to fight: so I went with the English armies, and we chased the gabiné unto the frontier of France; and it happened once that we joined in desperate battle, and there was a confusion, and the two parties became intermingled, and fought sword to sword and bayonet to bayonet, and a French soldier singled me out, and we fought for a long time, cutting, goring, and cursing each other, till at last we flung down our arms and grappled; long we wrestled, body to body, but I found that I was the weaker, and I fell. The French soldier’s knee was on my breast, and his grasp was on my throat, and he seized his bayonet, and he raised it to thrust me through the jaws; and his cap had fallen off, and I lifted my eyes up wildly to his face, and our eyes met, and I gave a loud shriek, and cried ‘Zincalo! Zincalo!’ and I felt him shudder, and he relaxed his grasp and started up, and he smote his forehead and wept, and then he came to me and knelt down by my side, for I was almost dead, and he took my hand and called me brother, and Zincalo, and he produced his flask and poured wine into my mouth, and I revived, and he raised me up, and led me from the concourse, and we sat down on a knoll, and the two parties were fighting all around, and he said, ‘Let the dogs fight and tear each other’s throats till they are all destroyed, what matters it to the Zincali; they are not of our blood, and shall that be shed for them?’ So we sat for hours on the knoll, and discoursed on matters pertaining to our people; and I could have listened for years, for he told me secrets which made my ears tingle, and I soon found that I knew nothing, though I had before considered myself quite Zincalo.....So we sat till the sun went down, and the battle was over, and he proposed that we should both flee to his own country and live there with the Zincali; but my heart failed me; so we embraced, and he departed to the gabiné, whilst I returned to our own battalions.

Mr. Borrow.—“Did you know from what country he came?”

Antonio.—“He told me he was a Maypro.

Mr. Borrow.—“You mean a Magyar, or Hungarian?”

Antonio.—“Just so ; and I have repented ever since that I did not follow him.” (p. 234).

Hungary has been generally thought to be the head-quarters of the gypsies. It was there that they were first noticed in 1417, and in 1423 they received permission to settle near the free and royal towns ; and subsequently they were employed in the manufacture of arms, and more particularly of cannon-balls. But even here they have not been reclaimed from their vagabond life and thievish propensities, their attachment to each other, and hatred of the rest of mankind.

Throughout the Russian empire gypsies are found in considerable numbers, except in the government of St. Petersburg, where they are prohibited. Mr. Borrow considers the whole race as beautiful, but those of Russia, who are called “Zigani,” as pre-eminently so. Though manifestly of southern extraction, they are able to endure great exposure to cold, and seldom seek any better shelter than their tents ; and whether from exposure, or hardship and vice, they sooner grow haggard, and are then pre-eminently hideous and revolting.

“But in speaking of the Russian gypsies, those of Moscow must not be passed over in silence. The station which they have attained in society, in that most remarkable of cities, is so far above the sphere in which the remainder of their race pass their lives, that it may be considered as a phenomenon in gypsy history entitled to particular notice.”

“Those who have been accustomed to consider the gypsy as a wandering outcast, incapable of appreciating the blessings of a settled and civilized life, or, if abandoning his vagabond propensities and becoming stationary, as one who never ascends higher than the condition of a low trafficker, will be surprised to learn that amongst the gypsies of Moscow there are not a few who inhabit stately houses, go abroad in elegant equipages, and are behind the higher orders of the Russians neither in appearance nor mental acquirements. To the female part of the gypsy colony at Moscow is to be attributed the merit of this partial rise from degradation and abjectness, they having, from time immemorial, so successfully cultivated the vocal art, that though in the midst of a nation by whom song is more cherished and cultivated, and its principles better understood, than by any other of the civilized globe, the gypsy choirs of Moscow are, by the general voice of the Russian public, admitted to be unrivalled in that most amiable of all accomplishments. It is a fact notorious in Russia, that the celebrated Catalani was so enchanted with the voice of one of these gypsy songstresses (who, after the former had displayed her noble Italian talent before a splendid audience at Moscow, stepped forward, and with an astonishing burst of almost angelic melody, so enraptured every ear that even applause forgot its duty), that she tore from her own shoulders a shawl of cachmere, which had been presented to her by the Father of Rome, and, embracing the gypsy, insisted on her acceptance of the splendid gift, saying that it

had been intended for the matchless songster, which she now perceived she herself was not."

Yet even here the few distinguished individuals have had little effect on the other gypsies, the majority of them remaining in nearly the same condition as in other countries—the women telling fortunes, or singing or dancing at taverns—the men engaged for the most part in horse-dealing.

" Their favourite place of resort in the summer time is Marina Rotze, a species of sylvan garden, about two versts from Moscow. Thither, tempted by curiosity, I drove, one fine evening. On my arrival, the Ziganas came flocking out from their little tents, and from the inn erected for public accommodation. Standing on the seat of the calash, I addressed them, in a loud voice, in the English dialect of the Rommany. A shrill scream of wonder was instantly raised, and welcomes and blessings were poured forth in floods of musical Rommany, though above all predominated the cry of '*Kak mitute kamama*,' or, 'How we love you !' for at first they mistook me for one of their wandering brethren from the distant lands, come over the great *panee* or ocean to visit them.

" The religion which these singular people externally professed was the Greek, and they mostly wore crosses of copper or gold ; but when I questioned them on this subject in their native language, they laughed, and said it was only to please the Russians." (p. 10).

Mr. Borrow describes the gypsies of all the countries he visited as equally and totally void of all religion, and as not even giving a thought to anything beyond the present, save in occasional single instances of some vague notions of metempsychosis. This might inconsiderately be ascribed to the wandering, out-cast life they have led, and to the enmity produced thereby towards all the Busnee, and everything belonging to them. But in Mr. Borrow they found no place for such feelings: on the contrary, they all regarded him as a brother, and gave the most unequivocal proofs of their sincerity in the services they rendered, and still more in their unlimited confidence and their frank unreserved communications :—

" All which relates to their original religion is shrouded in mystery, and is likely so to remain. They may have been idolators, or atheists, or what they are now, totally neglectful of worship of any kind." (p. 158). " It is evident that the Romas arrived at the confines of Europe without any certain or rooted faith ; for knowing, as we do, with what tenacity they retain their primitive habits and customs, their sect being, in all points, the same as it was four hundred years ago, it appears impossible that they should have forgotten their peculiar god, if in any peculiar god they trusted." (p. 161).

In his intercourse with the Gitanos of Cordova, Mr. Borrow shows how he endeavoured to interest them in religion :—

“ They said that they never admitted strangers to their houses, save at their marriage festivals, when they flung their doors open to all.As for myself, I was admitted without scruple to their private meetings, and was made a participator of their most secret thoughts. During our intercourse, some remarkable scenes occurred : one night, more than twenty of us, men and women, were assembled..... We all gathered round a huge brasero of flaming charcoal, and began conversing *sobre las cosas de Egipto*, when I proposed that, as we had no better means of amusing ourselves, we should endeavour to turn into the Calo language some piece of devotion, that we might see whether this language, the gradual decay of which I had frequently heard them lament, was capable of expressing any other matters than those which related to horses, mules, and gypsy traffic. It was in this cautious manner that I first endeavoured to divert the attention of these singular people to matters of eternal importance. My suggestion was received with acclamations, and we forthwith proceeded to the translation of the Apostles’ Creed. I first recited in Spanish, in the usual manner, and without pausing, this noble confession, and then repeated it again, sentence by sentence—the Gitanos translating as I proceeded. They exhibited the greatest eagerness and interest in their unwonted occupation, and frequently broke into loud disputes as to the best rendering, many being offered at the same time. In the meanwhile, I wrote down from their dictation, and at the conclusion I read aloud the translation, the result of the united wisdom of the assembly ; whereupon they all raised a shout of exultation, and appeared not a little proud of the composition.” (p. 250).

And again, at Madrid, Mr. Borrow says—

“ The reader will have already gathered from the conversations reported in these volumes.....that there is a wide difference between addressing Spanish gitanos and English peasantry : of a certainty what will do well for the latter is calculated to make no impression on these thievish, half wild people. ‘ Try them with the Gospel (I hear some one cry), which speaks to all !’ I did try them with the Gospel, and in their own language ; I commenced with Pepa and Chicharona. Determined that they should understand it, I proposed that they themselves should translate it..... We commenced with St. Luke : they rendering into Rommany the sentences which I delivered to them in Spanish. They proceeded as far as the eighth chapter, in the middle of which they broke down. Was that to be wondered at ? The only thing which astonished me was, that I had induced two such strange beings to advance so far in a task so unwonted, and so entirely at variance with their habits, as translation. These chapters I frequently read over to them, explaining the subject in the best manner I was able. They said it was *lacho*, and *jucal*, and *misto*, all of which words express approval of the quality of a thing. Were they improved—were their hearts softened by these Scripture lectures ? I know not. Pepa committed a rather daring theft shortly afterwards, which compelled her to conceal herself for a fortnight ; it is quite possible, however, that she may remember the contents of those chapters on her death-bed ; if so, will the attempt have been a futile one ? ” (p. 358).

And this is all the encouraging and the favourable side which Mr. Borrow, with all his partialities towards the Gitanos, can hold out; and this little, we are sorry to say, appears to be neutralized by the concluding anecdote of the volume, in which Mr. Borrow tells us that he had been speaking to them for some time in Spanish, and then adds—

“I warmed with my subject. I subsequently produced a manuscript book, from which I read a portion of Scripture, and the Lord’s Prayer and Apostles’ Creed, in Rommany. When I had concluded, I looked around me. The features of the assembly were twisted, and the eyes of all turned upon me with a frightful squint: not an individual present but squinted—the genteel Pepa, the good-humoured Chicharona, &c.; all squinted. The gypsy fellow, the contriver of the *burla* (mockery), squinted worst of all. Such are the gypsies.” (p. 362).

The uses we would make of the acquaintance with this extraordinary people, which we acquire through Mr. Borrow, are, first, as a motive of gratitude and thanksgiving to God that we have been born of Christian parents, and are surrounded by Christian institutions. We have not often the means of estimating exactly the amount, by a fair comparison of ourselves with men in a state of nature. The vices of savages we attribute to ignorance and lawlessness; the more aggravated guilt of Mohammedan and idolatrous lands we trace to their gross superstitions; but in the gypsies we have a people as shrewd, as knowing, and as free from superstition as Mr. Owen himself, or any Socialist, could desire, and can study in the gypsies the natural tendencies of fallen man, even in the midst of civilized society, when that man is left to himself, to choose his own laws, and impose his own restraints, and is not acknowledging those laws and those restraints which have, in fact, rendered society civilized. Passing by all the higher ends and the eternal blessings which Christianity ensures to man, it is certain that for the lower ends and temporal blessings of civilization Europe is indebted to Christianity. In this lower sphere of Christianity the first principle inculcated is a regard to others, and that without partiality—remembering the precept, “Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them.” But the motives of the natural man never rise above selfishness; his attachments to his kindred and clan are all subordinate to his selfishness. And these opposite principles are habitual, and operate continually; so that the child of a Christian community imbibes a regard for others with the first dawn of consciousness, and long before reasoning begins; and the child of the gypsy imbibes from the very first selfishness in all its forms—to the errate, or blood, because it is *his own* blood.

In the gypsy there is no fear and no reverence, though they sometimes affect a reverence for the things towards which a reverence is felt by those whom they wish to deceive. They have great perseverance, and great command of themselves, where any selfish purpose is to be accomplished. There is a curious instance in two of them, whom Mr. Borrow knew at Madrid, to obtain the liberation of a man who had been condemned to hard labour for ten years, and was son of one of these women, and husband of the other:—

“This misfortune caused inexpressible grief to his wife and mother, who determined to exert every effort to procure his liberation. The readiest way which occurred to them was to procure an interview with the Queen Regent Christina, who they doubted not would forthwith pardon the culprit, provided they had an opportunity of assailing her with their gypsy discourse, for ‘they well knew what to say.’ I at that time lived close by the palace, in the street of Santiago, and daily, for the space of a month, saw them bending their steps in that direction. One day they came to me in a great hurry, with a strange expression on both their countenances. ‘We have seen Christina, my son,’ said Pepita to me. ‘Within the palace?’ I enquired. ‘Within the palace,’ answered the sybil. ‘Christina at last saw and sent for us, as I knew she would; I told her fortune, and Chicharona danced before her.’ ‘What did you tell her?’ ‘I told her many things which I need not tell you: know, however, that, amongst other things, I told her that the little queen would die, and then she would be Queen of Spain. I told her, moreover, that within three years she would marry the son of the King of France, and it was her fortune to die Queen of France and Spain.’ ‘And did you not dread her anger, when you told her these things?’ ‘Dread her! the busnee? (screamed Pepita). No, my child, she dreaded me far more. I looked at her *so*—and raised my finger *so*—and Chicharona clapped her hands; and the busnee believed all I said, and was afraid of me: and then I asked for the pardon of my son, and she pledged her word to see into the matter; and when we came away she gave me this baria of gold, and to Chicharona this other; so, at all events, we have *hokkanoed* (hoccussed) the queen. May an evil end overtake her body, the busnee!’” (p. 318).

This incident throws light upon the character of the gypsies, and that of their dupes. It shows that the gypsies, for their selfish purposes, work upon the credulity of those who have some reverence and fear remaining; and while these last are deceived, and yield a willing ear to what seems to be a blessing, nothing but curses are in the heart of those who deceive them.

We live in Christendom—in that part of the earth where a Church has subsisted for centuries; we are surrounded by institutions, venerable not merely for antiquity, but for their intrinsic excellence; and the permanency of these institutions, the hale vigour which they exhibit, is sometimes ascribed, in general

terms, to the soundness of their original constitution and the temperate use by the possessors of the power with which they had been endowed. Or, speaking more particularly, men are too apt to say that, in Christian communities of modern times, the improved condition of mankind has rendered their intercourse with each other reciprocally beneficial; so that each community, each institution, and each individual, in improving another, becomes more improved, by a continual progression; and we hear men talk of the Christianity of these enlightened times as if it were another Gospel—as if, like a system of ethics, it had been perfected more and more by discussion, and increased in power and influence from becoming more and more perfect.

We do not sufficiently prize the blessing of belonging to a Christian community, because we do not perceive its amount. We find ourselves there, we have never known what it is to be otherwise situated—we cannot conceive what we ourselves should be, if we were in all other respects precisely what we now are, *excepting Christianity*. The greatest criminal we meet with, or the veriest infidel in all Christendom, cannot, by the contrast, teach us all that we owe to Christianity; for they have unconsciously imbibed some of its hallowing and restraining influences in their years of infancy, and the community with which they are constrained to hold intercourse forces upon them some of its own observances. And the very instincts, as they may be called, which bind together husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister, and which, from the analogy of animals, we might suppose *natural* to man, are not so; they are in man the fruits of Christianity; all mankind, in the state of nature, are less amiable than the brute creation. The description of the natural man is, “that they are filled with all unrighteousness, haters of God, spiteful, disobedient to parents, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful.” (Rom. i.)

This extreme degradation of man, in consequence of the fall, we can seldom verify by instances which are not liable to exception. If we point to savages, their cruelties may be ascribed to barbarism, and would yield, it might be said, before culture and civilization. If we name the Thugs and Aghoree of India, their enormities are ascribed to superstition. It is only when we can both get amongst a people, and live with them, that we can thoroughly understand the motives and principles from whence their actions flow: we fall into mistakes concerning any people whom we know only by report, or know for a short time. And it is only through the knowledge of a people who have

lived in the midst of Christians, and have had the opportunity of acquiring all those advantages which we possess, and who, withal, *have never been Christians*, that we can properly estimate the blessing of Christianity.

The *unnatural* excesses of evil, as they seem to us, are the natural and necessary fruits of the fall—are the propensities which corrupt nature would always exhibit, but for the restraining influences of the grace of God; and which influences are not merely within the bosom of the Church, but hallow its vicinity, pervade its very atmosphere, and impart to those around an outward appearance of sanctity. Men who live in the same community with the religious imbibe much of their manner and practice, and, by imitation or sense of propriety or shame, are restrained, when void of religious principle.

The excesses of evil exhibited in this book we had no conception of as existing anywhere in Europe—they were only associated in our minds with such countries as central Africa or New Zealand. Two girls are spoken of, the daughters of Pepa, and one of them only thirteen, who are perfect monsters of depravity; the elder was called the One-eyed, the younger the Scorpion. The mother reproaches the daughters for idleness, in not telling fortunes or stealing; and both girls exclaim against such mean villany, and assert that they will condescend to nothing lower than jockeying and highway robbery. To this Mr. Borrow says—

“ You do not mean to say, O One-eyed, that you are a jockey, and that you rob on the highway.

The One-eyed.—“ I am a jockey, brother, and many a time I have robbed upon the road, as all our people know. I dress myself as a man, and go forth with some of them. I have robbed alone; I alone once robbed a cuadrilla of twenty gallegos, who were returning to their own country, after cutting the harvests of Castile; I stripped them of their earnings, and could have stripped them of their very clothes had I wished, for they were down on their knees like cowards. I love a brave man, be he busno or gypsy. When I was not much older than the Scorpion, I went, with several others, to rob the cortijo of an old man. We broke in at midnight, and bound the old man; we knew he had money, but he said no, and would not tell us where it was; so we tortured him, pricking him with our knives, and burning his hands over the lamp; all, however, would not do. At last I said—‘ Let us try the *pimientos* ;’ so we took the green pepper husks, pulled open his eyelids, and rubbed the pupils with the green pepper fruit. That was the worst pinch of all. Would you believe it?—the old man bore it. Then our people said—‘ Let us kill him :’ but I said, ‘ No, it were a pity :’ so we spared him, though we got nothing. I have loved that old man ever since for his firm heart, and should have wished him for a husband.

Scorpion.—“Ojala, that I had been in that cortijo, to see such sport !

Mr. Borrow.—“Do you fear God, O Tuerta ?

The One-eyed.—“Brother, I fear nothing.

Mr. Borrow.—“Do you believe in God, O Tuerta ?

The One-eyed.—“Brother, I do not ; I hate all connected with that name ; the whole is folly. If I go to church, it is but to spit at the images. I spat at the bulto of Maria this morning, and I love the Corojai and the Londone (English), because they are not baptized.

Mr. Borrow.—“You, of course, never pray ?

The One-eyed.—“No, no ; there are three or four old words, taught me by some old people, which sometimes I say to myself ; I believe they have both force and virtue.

Mr. Borrow.—“I would fain hear ; pray tell me them.

The One-eyed.—“Brother, they are words not to be repeated.

Mr. Borrow.—“Why not ?

The One-eyed.—“They are holy words, brother.

Mr. Borrow.—“Holy ! you say there is no God ; if there be no God, there can be nothing holy ; pray tell me the words, O Tuerta.

The One-eyed.—“Brother, I dare not.

Mr. Borrow.—“Then you *do* fear something ?

The One-eyed.—“Not I. ‘*Saboca enrecar Maria ereria.*’ And now I wish I had not said them.

Mr. Borrow.—“You are distracted, O Tuerta : the words say simply, ‘Dwell within us, blessed Maria !’ You have spitten on her bulto this morning in the church, and now you are afraid to repeat four words, amongst which is her name.

The One-eyed.—“I did not understand them, but I wish I had not said them.” (p. 356).

Mr. Borrow’s reflection upon the above is, “that there is no individual, however hardened, who is utterly godless.”

But our inference is very different. We see nothing of an acknowledgment of God in an invocation of Mary, and that ignorantly done. Yet it does strikingly confirm our position, that the operation and influences of religion are felt by those who are not religious, when we see wretches such as these imbibe even foolish superstitions.

A fearful tale is told (p. 291) of a gypsy soldier, named Chaleco, whose character seems more satanic than human, though gypsy only on the mother’s side. His father loved him, and treated him with kindness, but his mother had taught him to hate his father, because not a gypsy :—

“When a boy I used to stroll about the plains, that I might not see my father ; and my father would follow me, and beg me to look upon him, and would ask me what I wanted ; and I would reply, ‘Father, the only thing I want is to see you dead.’.....When I was about twelve years old my father became distracted, and died.”

And this parricidal boyhood is succeeded by a manhood of all sorts of enormities.

Mr. Borrow meets with an inn at Tarifa kept by a family of gypsies, in which some characteristic scenes occur, in their cursing in the gypsy tongue the parties whom they are flattering and caressing in Spanish; and the landlady tells him that she never had but one child, which died an infant; and then says—

“The child of one of the principal people was put to me to nurse, but I hated it for its white blood, as you may well believe. It never throve, for I did it a private mischief; and though it grew up, and is now a youth, it is mad.”

This was not at all suspected, for many Spanish ladies visited the house whilst Mr. Borrow was there:—

“Amongst others, came a very fine woman, the widow of a colonel lately slain in battle; she brought with her a beautiful innocent little girl, her daughter, between three and four years of age. The gypsy appeared to adore her; she sobbed, she shed tears, she kissed the child, she blessed it, she fondled it. I had my eye upon her countenance, and it brought to my recollection that of a she-wolf, which I had once seen in Russia, playing with her whelp beneath a birch-tree. ‘You seem to love that child very much, O my mother,’ said I to her as the lady was departing. ‘I do not love it, O my son, I do not love it; I love it so much, that I wish it may break its leg as it goes down stairs, and its mother also.’” (p. 284).

We might multiply such extracts, to show how closely in all respects the gypsies verify the characteristics of man in a state of nature, as portrayed by St. Paul in writing to the Romans. They are “haters of God, spiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful.” But we have said enough to prove the extreme degradation into which man would sink but for Christianity; and that the mere indirect and secondary influences of religion are fraught with blessings manifold.

There is one other point to which we must direct the attention of our readers before we leave these interesting volumes, namely, the language of the gypsies. They have no books of their own—their language is only a speech, which we know by the report of those who, from hearing them, have written it in the best way they could. But it is substantially the same language in all the countries where they are scattered, as is proved by Mr. Borrow having learned it in England, and being understood by them, whether in Spain, Italy, Hungary, or Moscow. The gypsies thus present the extraordinary phenomenon of a language transmitted orally for many centuries, and remaining unchanged during such extensive migrations, and being preserved without any written characters.

Mr. Borrow, who, from his very extensive acquaintance with the subject, is the most competent witness, does not hesitate to affirm that the gypsy speech is of oriental origin—that the words which denote ideas common to all men; and the names of universal things, as the elements, metals, &c.; and the universal relationships of man to man, as father, husband, &c., are derived from the Sanscrit, like Hindustani, and the cognate dialects. Enough, we think, is said in these volumes to establish the two points, that the language spoken by the gypsies is a distinct language, and that its origin must be sought for to the eastward of Egypt, and even of the Persians; but we hope that Mr. Borrow will return to the subject, according to the hope which he expresses in his second volume (p. 4), and make us acquainted with those gypsies who settled nearer to the country from whence all originally migrated, and may be expected to have retained more of their original dialect, and to have adopted fewer of the words found in the countries through which they passed.

Mr. Borrow is a practical man; he has not arrived at his conclusions by speculating in his closet, but has had them forced upon him, and wrought into him by personal experience and close contact; and there is the soundness and vigour of a practical man about all which he writes. And he seems also to possess that acquaintance with the Eastern dialects which qualifies him to render his practical knowledge available towards clearing up one of the most obscure portions of history, as well as the darkest point, as it regards philology and science. As a practical man, he doubts whether any instance has occurred of the invention of language by man; and then comes to the sound conclusion, that, not being the invention of man, it is the gift of God.

“Perhaps one of the strongest grounds for concluding that the origin of language was divine is the fact, that no instance can be adduced of the invention, we will not say of a language, but even of a single word, that is in use in society of any kind. Although new dialects are continually being formed, it is only by a system of modification, by which roots almost coeval with time itself are continually being reproduced under a fresh appearance, and under new circumstances.” (vol. ii., p. 139).

To which we would merely add the obvious corollary—that the confusion of speech at Babel was *also divine*; and that there are certain classes of language traceable severally to the primeval tribes among whom the earth was divided at the dispersion from Babel.

The vulgar notion that the gypsies came from Egypt is entitled to no more weight than to render it probable that some of them had passed through Egypt in their way to the west of

Europe, and received their name from the place whence they last arrived.

“The only clue to arrive at any certainty respecting their origin is the language which they still speak among themselves.” (vol. ii., p. 106).

This Mr. Borrow shows to be derived from the Sanscrit—a language which, in its original form, has long ceased to be spoken, but which is—

“The mother of a certain class or family of languages ; for example, those spoken in Hindustan, with which most of the European, whether of the Slavonian, Gothic, or Celtic stock, have some connection..... Bearing the same analogy to the Sanscrit tongue as the Indian dialects specified above, we find the Rommany, or speech of the Roma, or Zingali, as they style themselves, known in England and Spain as gypsies and gitanos. This speech, wherever it is spoken, is in all principal points one and the same, though more or less corrupted by foreign words, picked up in the various countries to which those who use it have penetrated. One remarkable feature must not be passed over without notice, namely, the very considerable number of pure Slavonic or Russian words which are to be found imbedded within it, whether it be spoken in Spain or Germany, in England or Italy ; from which circumstance we are led to the conclusion that those people, in their way from the east, travelled in one large compact body, and that their route lay through the steppes of Russia, where they probably tarried for a considerable period as nomade herdsmen, and where numbers of them are still to be found at the present day. Besides the many Slavonian words in the gypsy tongue, another curious feature attracts the attention of the philologist—an equal or still greater quantity of terms from the modern Greek (among the Spanish gypsies). Still more abundant, however, than the mixture of Greek—still more abundant than the mixture of Slavonian, is the alloy in the gypsy language, wherever spoken, of modern Persian words.....like.....the adoption into the popular dialects of India of an infinity of modern Persian words,” &c. (vol ii., pp. 108-114).

As the language of the gypsies is only *spoken*, and not *written*, Mr. Borrow very rightly observes that we must regard the different power of the same letters of the alphabet in different countries, in tracing the gypsy words to their original source. For the *same* gypsy word would be *differently written* in Spain, in Russia, and in England. And we must also bear in mind that, in some countries, letters of the same organ are perpetually interchanged, even in the language of the natives ; and much more in their writing a foreign language, like that of the gypsies :—

“To those who may feel inclined to call in question the correctness of our derivations, we wish to observe, that, in order to form a correct opinion on this point, it is necessary to be well acquainted with the manner in which not only the Gitanos, but the lower order of the Spaniards themselves, are in the habit of changing and transposing letters. In some provinces the liquids are used indifferently for each

other—*l* for *r*, *r* for *n*, and *l*, *y*, for *ll*, and *vice versa*. With respect to the Gitanos, they not only confuse the liquids, but frequently substitute the *l* for the *d* ; for example, they have changed the Persian *duriya*, the sea, into *luriya* ; and in their word for thunder, have afforded a curious instance how the change of a letter may render it difficult to trace a word to its etymon. Unacquainted with this habit of theirs, no one would venture to derive *lurian*, their term for thunder, from the Sanscrit ; yet when spelt and pronounced *durian*, as it ought to be, the difficulty at once vanishes—*durian* being twin brother to the Celtic *darian*, which is clearly allied to the Danish *torden*, the German *donner*, the English *thunder*, which latter is but a slight modification of the Sanscrit *indra*.” (Advertisement to the Vocabulary).

It is also observed, that many have confounded together the slang of thieves and the gypsy language, from many gypsy words having been really *adopted* into the thievish dialect ; which is called *slang* and *thieves' Latin* in England, *Germania* and *Red Italian* abroad. This adoption is accounted for by the congenial propensities of the thieves and gypsies, and by the former seeking the acquaintance of the latter as more accomplished in the arts of knavery :—

“ From this association were produced two results—European fraud became sharpened by coming into contact with Asiatic craft ; whilst European tongues, by imperceptible degrees, became recruited with various words, many of which have long been stumbling-blocks to the philologist, who, whilst stigmatizing them as words of mere vulgar invention, or of unknown origin, has been far from dreaming that a little more research, or reflection, would have proved their affinity to the Slavonic, Persian, or Roma—perhaps to the mysterious object of his veneration, the Sanscrit, the sacred tongue of the palm-covered regions of Ind ; words originally introduced into Europe by objects too miserable to occupy for a moment his lettered attention—the despised denizens of the tents of Roma.” (vol. ii., p. 156).

ART. VIII.—*Church Buildings Statutes, from 59 Geor. III. to 1st, 2nd, and 3rd of Victoria.*

AMID the numerous evils which are the remains of an abrogated system, none has hitherto pressed deeper upon the exertions and spirit of true Churchmen than the unfortunate and unequal distribution of their powers over masses perfectly uncontrollable by any human exertion. Parishes of immense extent, in point of distance, frequently of twenty miles in circuit even in the thronged vicinity of the metropolis, or of unwieldy population on narrower extent, have been productive of immense evil. The Church of England minister has had, consequently, to struggle against a

compactly united mass in parts of his parish, where some sectarian had made an inroad, and confined his attack to that small portion alone: for the Dissenters have sufficient craft to perceive the advantage of keeping their number of souls in proportion to their self-dubbed ministers, and every one takes his thousand, and tries hard to do them justice, and to maintain the integrity of his small contingent to the stock of sectarianism. The Church has consequently had to struggle against these solid squares, and nothing could have saved her but that want of union which Dissent necessarily brings with it, in its endless ramifications, such as one before us—"a member of the seceding Kirk of the Kirk of Secession from the Kirk of Scotland:" these, together with that personality denoted by the terms Wesleyans, Whitefieldites, Muggletonians, and with possibly such 'happy mistakes of a *pars pro toto* as are indicated by the term *Baptist*, or that modest assumption expressed in the term *Independent*, a term, by the bye, now converted into *Congregationalist*, by a lucky transition from too much to no definite meaning at all—nothing but these little peccadilloes among the Dissenters, to say nothing of that most abominable of all, the Socinians, equally heretical with other sectarians, in affixing a human name as their designation—nothing but these things, saving the extraordinary mercy of God to his Church, could have prevented her utter annihilation.

The total number of parishes returned to Parliament in the Ecclesiastical Revenue Report of 1835 amounted for England and Wales to 10,718; now dividing our population, taking it at 18,000,000, by this, gives for each separate cure of souls 1679. This would not be so preposterous as the present position of things in numerous parts of the country, and it is deeply to be lamented that an entirely new division of parishes, partaking somewhat of this as its basis, is not immediately adopted. The dioceses have altered their limits—why are parishes exempt from all laws? The efficiency of the Church would be most powerfully increased by it. In the parish where these words are written the writer remembers the time, though its present amount of population exceeds 110,000, that the parish church did not accommodate 500. It had chapels of ease amounting possibly to three. It has now six new churches, all filled, no chapel less so, and others are building to meet existing demands for room. What, then, is the fact? That the more strength becomes directed to definable limits, the stronger are the results from its exertion. A church-going spirit must be raised among a people, and what has been done here is but an evidence of the immense good that might be effected in the great aggregate of parishes,

were strength properly proportioned to its due sphere of exertion. For—let us not be misapprehended—the clergy are unlike any of the Dissenting teachers. Wherever they are, the poor will look to them for aid ; for there is a catholicity of spirit, a liberality of sentiment, a nobility of demeanour and manner not to be mistaken or misapprehended by their poorer brethren. The Churchman has to sustain the broad brunt of all applications—his is a *fixed* position ; his ministrations, unlike the changing Wesleyans and others, partake largely of this fixity. He studies, appreciates, comprehends, and understands the relations of all around him. The consequence is, that he is by far the most intelligent spiritual agent, and his labours are the more abundant from that very cause. But, independent of this, he is the public agent of the Government, and all information, all documents, all references are derived from him. The care of all registration, until recently, was in his hands, and its removal from him was among the foulest acts of the Whigs, and of the greatest possible evil to the country, desecrating the marriage service for one point, placing the Church and State at issue on that question, and doing worse than even in the time of the Commonwealth, when these things were done at least, Milton tells us, *before a magistrate*, and not before the *clerk of an Union*.

This was his labour once, and the security of the churches was at least equal to the private dwelling of the union officer. Then again Dissenters confining their exertions to their violent harangues on one day of the week, without cure of souls, while the Churchman was worn down by visitation of the sick, burials, baptisms, gave this party also no mean advantage for the promotion of schism, since they could apply their leisure hours to sapping conversationally, by dipping into the cottages the adherence to the Church. To recur to individual instances : the church duty in most large parishes, independent of the visitation of the sick, occupies several hours of severe exertion—exertion of such a character as to require repose after its development ; so that the very character of his ministrations was calculated to subdue the activity even of the strongest man. It is preposterous to anticipate that the curate of such a parish as Stepney, after the burial service had been read by him twenty or thirty times on the Sabbath, should be equally prepared, in point of bodily exertion, to compete in the evening duty afterwards with one who had performed no such onerous labours. No Dissenting functions require greater exertion than a short extemporaneous effusion, dubbed prayer, with a similar discourse, which, from its character of saying all that comes uppermost off-hand, requires little study, or deeply weighed views of solemn ques-

tions. In the flippancy of Dissent, it plunges in *medias res* with vulgar self-sufficiency, and occasions, consequently, little more fatigue than simply conversation. The buildings, also, in which the contrast arises would increase the difficulty of position—churches, if rightly constructed, being of immense extent, of high architectural excellence, and this is not always combined with sufficient attention, on the part of the builder, to acoustics; whereas the vile, barn-like, meagre edifices of Dissenters have at least the advantage of narrower limits, and adaptation to only one end, viz., to hold the greatest number in the smallest possible space, and certainly calculated to occasion less difficulty to the speaker. It is curious to trace how altered from their primitive position many of these bodies have become. No one of them has more injured good taste by rearing up hideous conventicles than the Wesleyans, but now that some larger degree of wealth pours in upon that body, they are already exhibiting all the appetency of that commodity, and in lieu of the four plain walls studiously shunning sinful architecture's plastic charms, we have now buildings which, although of no high order of taste, yet are lavish of architectural embellishment. Shade of Wesley! how would thine eyes quail at the chapel in Great Queen-street, or that modern abomination by Bishopsgate!

But to revert to our question—difficulties of a peculiar character were soon found to embarrass the sphere of clerical exertion, and Dr. Yates, we believe, was the first to indicate where the Dissenters were making the prime attack—from the inefficiency of Church accommodation. This was the first evil to remedy, and means were soon taken to obviate it, but means, unhappily, that omitted four mighty matters that should have moved *pari passu* with this effort. The first, *a total alteration of parishes*; the second, *a provision for the clergy of the new churches*; the third, *the application of church-rate to them*; the fourth, *the division of all charitable donations and church estates, in the old parishes, equally among the new subdivisions or fresh parishes*. A set of Statutes, which stand at the head of this article, were accordingly brought forward with the best intentions, but evidently failing in success from their enactors being too weak to carry out their bold original design. We allude to the Church Building Statutes, the source, in their present imperfect form, of many misunderstandings among the clergy, and the leading defect of which has arisen from doing things by halves, and not carrying out an idea nobly and straightforwardly.

The present position of new churches—wholly unendowed, with mutilated rites, scarcely defined functions, a clergy nearly unpaid, with districts of immense population appended, which

the mother parishes are delighted to throw off, to get rid of their cost, and the very ministry at issue among themselves, from a want of legal exactness in striking out the present ecclesiastical *status quo*—is one that cannot continue, and must have immediate remedies applied. This requires far more consideration than the ridiculous follies of a set of babies, who cry out for crosses and crucifixes simply because they must be fractious about something. It is not necessary to do more than simply to express a sober opinion on *this* party, as has been already done by the bishops, to sink them. There always will be, of course, odd fellows, singular people, like Simon Stylites, who will seek out and perpetuate past abominations and absurdities; but it is not a necessary consequence, from these exceptions to an age, that the age itself should have recourse to this senility without the superiority, goodness, and practical experience of that period of life. There always will be persons like the *seven sleepers*, who will awake and find everything around them different, but will not move on with time or believe in its progress. Yet how opposed are such persons to the great Christian Exemplar. He stood above his age, and formed a new one; he himself showed his faith, shaped to the progress of intelligence; and, as intelligence progresses, new light breaks out in larger scintillations from it, for it is adapted both to receive and transmit the blended powers of intelligence and spirituality. The Church Building Acts should be wholly remodelled and cleared of all difficulties that impede the religious progress of the people. At present they exhibit a confusion of *district parishes*, *district chapelries*, and *ecclesiastical districts*—every one of which divisions, from being incomplete, leads to confusion. The time is gone by when men are to speak of Church property as private property; it is held *for uses*—for the acquittal of obligations of a most solemn character; it is for the laity as well as the clergy. Nor is it too much to expect that large livings should be so applied. How have they become large? In many cases, by increase of population. Are the holders, then, who know what they take, to consider themselves discharged from this responsibility? A parish occurs to us, for example, containing a mother church, to which is appended an income to the incumbent of about 1,500*l.* per annum; we believe this church has further church estates and churchwardens' dues, that amount together to as much more. Now can it be considered that this is held otherwise than for the general benefit of the parishioners, to supply amply the spiritual wants of the people, and to provide nobly for church sustentation? Yet will it be credited that in this parish there are two district

churches wholly unendowed, with three services performed in each, and that neither light, firing, nor cleansing is furnished to them, even repairs disputed, and the very elements of the Lord's supper it is hinted will not be long supplied. Now we fearlessly assert that the authorities of that parish are bound to appropriate the estates for the spiritual services performed in it; and, further, we affirm that they ought, by the fair wielding of the powers of the Church Building Commissioners, to be compelled to maintain *the three* as they do *the one*. If the Church be weak in some quarters, is it wonderful, when these disgraceful anomalies are visible? Portions of parishes are indulged in unnecessary splendour, while the other inhabitants of the same parish are subject to a heavy pew-rent. The maintenance of the churches of their divisions, providing an income for their ministers, is the *use* of such abundant spiritual funds, where they exist, and they ought to be made available. Anomalies of this character should be redressed, for many a glorious spirit will be crushed under their influence if they last. No division ought to take place, except a perfect and complete one. The powers of the Church Building Commissioners only need enlargement to do it; and Sir Robert Harry Inglis would occupy his time beneficially, and with great chance of an excellent practical result, should he apply himself to the revision and extension of the Church Building Statutes. This Commission has the power to form districts, to award fees without the consent of the incumbent when a district is formed, and exercises this latter power at least with some degree of spirit; but this advances but a short stage to the required wants of the country.

The Benefices Plurality Bill has also two very important clauses, giving to the archbishop power to separate portions from various parishes, and to append them to others of a more convenient locality, for the purposes of divine worship. But nothing short of a completely new parochial division of the country will meet the immense necessity of the people.

And is it not a frightful statement, *that of the livings in England and Wales, five thousand are under 200l. per annum?* This state of things led, doubtless, to the Church Building Statutes, which, though they go some way to relieve, yet do not remove this immense mass of clerical pauperism. Now though there is a vast deal of reason in what is said as to the literary benefit of a clergy possessed of learned ease; and though the eloquence of Chalmers produced a most splendid passage, which has often been quoted in vindication of the theory; and though we love learning and prize deep erudition, and we are prepared to pay for it, and to pay for it nobly; there are yet

other requisites which demand attention, beyond the accomplishments of the clerical character. These are that simple-minded and earnest piety, which is to operate among the million—persons neither designed nor disposed to investigate beyond the surface, and who love teachers that will enter into their feelings, and not the abstract, speculative, theological principles. A spirit to refine everything marks the present entire era, and in this refinement we fear much of genuine and pure vigour becomes lost. Assuredly the clergy run no danger at present of sinking below their congregations in their teaching; but, on the other hand, there is much of their intended teaching that *to their hearers* is no teaching at all. Teaching it is, and in a high sense, we admit, but it is not teaching that does more than open the fountains of thought in a few gifted minds. It resembles the course of a public school—he who apprehends quickly has a chance of getting forward, but *væ victis* in those instances where the rapid thought is not followed by as rapid a conception. The opinion as to funds reserved for learned purposes should not be heeded, when respectable and pious clergymen can be gained by its partial sacrifice. All the chapters should be supported, but it would have been paying a costly price indeed for their services, had these bodies (without the cure of souls) been maintained in the late palmy state of their finances.

Let us, therefore, consider that question as fully disposed of; moreover, the recruits for science are not to be found in the same force among the wealthy as the poor—few rich men in the great aggregate will be found to escape the deadening effects of wealth. We proceed to consider the new churches in their internal arrangements. They are entirely without funds, in most instances, and the old authorities of parishes take delight in oppressing them, and keeping them down, that they may themselves enjoy those snug immunities that they have always done among each other, by means of which the grocer could give an order on the stationer, the stationer on the pastrycook, the pastrycook on the chandler, the chandler on the vintner, &c. These men formed snug cliques in the old division of parishes. We actually know an instance where suppers were given twice a week to the vestrymen, and vestries held purely to eat them, where Church estates of upwards of *a thousand pounds* per annum were consumed by these civic gluttons. The Church Building Acts ought to break down this system, and they have the power of doing so most effectually, if they exercise it. They can apportion *charitable gifts* as well as divide Church estates. With respect to this first, the immense evil at present existing from

the abuse of these is almost incalculable. We can point out, in a parish of 40,000 inhabitants, *trusts* which are represented by one individual—oftentimes by two, or three, at the most, in others. But we wish the clergy to be fully informed that, in all cases of the division into ecclesiastical districts, under the 59 Geo. III., c. 134, § 16, the old parish authorities are liable, by 3 Geo. IV., c. 72, § 20, to all repairs; and that, by appeal to the archdeacon, under the canon, they are also compelled to cleanse the church, which may be extended to paying pew-openers in the new church, since they are paid for cleansing the church, and to maintain beadles or officers to preserve quiet. We wish the clergy also to understand, that we are not putting things down at random, or vapouring about Church authority, like a certain archdeacon, who, lately delivering a grandiloquent charge on the subject of Church-rates, was met by the keen retort of one of his clergy—"You describe an excellent weapon if it could be wielded, but it is a sword that is *too sharp in the handle* to be used effectively." We assert fearlessly, that these things are enforceable by the archdeacon, and that we are not resting on the infirm foundation of canon law, but *canon law enforced by the Church Building Statutes*.

The position of the minister of a new church is most unfortunate. We know an instance where such an one paid 250*l.* out of his pocket during the first year of his ministry, besides paying two curates, and giving his own labour for nothing. The district minister should remember, that an organist, pew-openers, clerk, sexton, bell-ringer, firing and lighting, &c., cannot be estimated under 150*l.* per annum; nor can they be placed as low as that sum, but under the most rigid economical management. This sum every year hangs like an incubus on him, and compels him to have recourse to the "popular" preacher, or some equally illicit mode of obtaining support. It is not to be expected that he is to be constantly going round his parish, raising supplies for the church. For the poor he may do it unblushingly; but in the former case many feelings of delicacy intervene, and many a rebuff will he experience from the vulgar insolence of men who view him as one of an over-paid body. Again, is a minister to have this incessant care upon him—is he first to see to the church's support, and secondly to the poor? Is he to be crippled in his exertions for the latter by the perpetual recurrence of the former? Once more, what an aspect do the new churches exhibit in their maimed rites? One cannot bury. Another, a Christian church! cannot baptize. Another cannot marry. Another has no district. And though all the clergy were to visit tenfold more than they do, the demand would yet far exceed

the supply. Still many an incumbent stoutly refuses to grant an ecclesiastical district. Many a present rector of a large parish only keeps *one* curate, and this where the income is large, and ten curates would not be too many. These are a few of the anomalies that loudly call for the interference of the Legislature, but this brief statement does not describe half the known cases: for instance, if a clergyman has a pew-rent incumbency amounting to 150*l.*, and has to pay a curate, and all the current expenses, is he not in a much worse condition than a man who receives 50*l.* per annum, and gets this augmented, which is refused in the former instance? Nor is this all the perplexity in which matters are involved—the Church-rate question; remains in the *status quo*; and Ministers confess that they are satisfied with the *status quo*, and do not intend to go beyond it. Well, now then let us investigate a Conservative Cabinet's principle for so doing. The Braintree case was one in which the following point was litigated. The inhabitants of the place had a Church meeting, at which the churchwardens proposed a rate. This was opposed, and successfully, by the Radical party. After this the churchwardens, but *not at the meeting*, made a rate, and proceeded to levy it. This was opposed, and the judgment of the Ecclesiastical Court taken on the case. That court held the rate so made to be *legal*. An appeal was then made to the Court of Queen's Bench, and the decision of Lord Denman was, that the rate so made was *illegal*. Matters did not rest here; and the opinion of the judges, being appealed to, was confirmatory of the judgment of Lord Denman; but the judges added—*we do not decide the question of whether the churchwardens, with the minority at the meeting, in the Braintree case, could or could not make a legal rate: we only say that the rate made at a subsequent meeting by the church-warden was illegal*. The question is at last coming forward in another case, in the right form for *adjudicating* the question. A public meeting, for making a church-rate, having been convened by the churchwardens, and negatived, the churchwardens and the minority proceeded to make a rate. This rate was opposed, and is matter of future litigation; the question will, therefore, at last, we trust, be permitted to come in its fair shape for adjudication. Now, if the Conservative Cabinet be of opinion that the judges will assert the principle of church-rate in this latter case, their leaving the question untouched is no mystery; if not, it is, and a deep one, and, in our opinion, not a highly creditable one to them. But it is our belief that they know the opinion of the twelve judges already to be favourable, and if so, the remedy being in our own hands, we must apply it. This

question, fairly settled any way, must lead to results that cannot be unfavourable; for if church-rate cannot in this case be enforced, then the present Cabinet must make another provision; and if it can, it is quite needless to say that considerable difficulties in the way of many churches will be removed, but yet not all. An organist, light, firing, might even then be disputed, together with many other items, as to their forming distinct payments out of church-rates. We bring, then, the whole subject at once under the four following heads, and all processes short of them will be as inadequate to the end proposed as they will be inexpedient:—

1. That a general revision of parishes, to carry out the above objects, be made by the Legislature.

2. That every district church, chapelry, or ecclesiastical district, become, from the date of the bill, to all intents and purposes, a *distinct parish*.

3. That all rights, privileges, and offices, such as baptism, marriages, churchings, burials, registering the same in the books of the church where they are performed, with all dues and emoluments pertaining thereto, be vested in the incumbents for the time being of the said churches so made distinct and separate parishes; and that the emoluments arising therefrom, such as fees, dues, and other customary offerings, become the property of the said incumbents.

4. That all church estates, due regard being had to the number of souls, attached to such districts, be divided in proportions correspondent with their respective populations.

With respect to the first, the Ordnance Survey furnishes a capital means of dividing the country geographically. All questions of rates, taxes, &c., with the exception of church-rate, might remain *in statu quo*. We have no wish, in the first place, to effect anything further than to establish a strong ecclesiastical government—a portion for each minister that shall not both overtax exertion and means. But we think it better that even in other respects the measure should take place. A dozen Pavement Boards, for example, in one parish, appears to us both expensive, unnecessary, and inconvenient. Parishes that remain united for lay purposes, and divided for clerical, are not found of inconvenient operation in many instances. If it be required to rate the poorer on the richer, this could yet be done, but the first, though difficult to secure, is possible districts for clerical operations. If this be not done, the *hearts* of the poorer laity will be totally weaned from the Church.

As to the second head, “that every district church, chapelry, &c., become, from the date of the bill, to all intents and purposes

a distinct parish." The leading question is one of ecclesiastical right and patronage. Let the patron's rights, then, be secured; and surely, if he present to more pieces of distinct preferment, he has no right to complain. Compensation should be given if tithe be awarded; but if not, let the new preferments receive augmentation from the dean and chapter's property, and by grants from the crown, and fees of all kinds, even burial fees the Church Commission has the power to award. The Churchman, who gets rid of the care of thousands of souls, must expect to be at some cost for the relief; and if his curates, for example, be diminished, he ought to throw that portion of *saved* income on the divided portions. Neither would parishes be slack to endow, if they saw clearly the benefits likely to result from this measure: they would feel naturally anxious for, and interested in, the prosperity of their individual and sole unendowed minister. They would be easily induced to build a house for him, if able so to do; and the wealthier parishes, opening their eyes to the magnitude and importance of the Church question, would freely pour in their contributions to this most desirable end. There are so many ways, so many small streams, that could be poured into this broad channel, that the aspect of it would become enlarged almost imperceptibly. And what an object it would be to gain! What a reduction of pauperism, what an increase of intellectual might and vigour, when every unit of the population was telling in its place, and strengthening the great whole by its positive character for good, with no negative quantities to subdue its value. The present pauperism is in the habits of the people. The taxation is met by correspondent wages. A minister, who has leisure to look into the condition of his people, who could trace out the failure of resources, and minister advice to replenish them, curtailing the habits of dissipation and intemperance, inducing sacrifices for home and family, and fatherland, teaching the people to endure privation, and doing his best to mitigate its effects, is far beyond any police that a country can produce. They control the outbreak, but the minister checks the motives that urge the outbreak. We firmly believe, and have seen it repeatedly realized, that the resources that open from a judicious minister's direction have decreased pauperism immensely; and that the Poor Law Acts have been a nullity, in many an instance, under this skilful management. Reduction of the national debt would be the first thing effected by this arrangement; and it is one that would cost the nation nothing, and affect our private interests but triflingly.

As to the third point, "That all the offices of the Church should be performed in every church, and that all fees for their per-

formance should be paid to the respective officers of these so made distinct parishes." This is doing partially by the Church Commission, even where the parishes are not distinct. It is so necessary and so fair, that that highly valuable body will, we trust, enlarge its powers, and get not simply the minister, but all the subordinate officers, such as clerk, sexton, &c., included in the same category. Churchwardens also ought to possess the same powers in the districts as they do in the mother parish, though they do not—an anomaly which the proposed measure at once removes everywhere. The clergy of the ecclesiastical districts ought also to be fully informed that any registration, save in the books of the church where the duty is done, is *illegal*. The minister that performs the duty is to register the same, and any general abstract from the district church made at the mother church is wholly *illegal*, though often practised. All divisions under the 59th of George III. come under the operation of this law. No rector or vicar has the power to insert a district minister's name in his registry. The justice of this is apparent; for the individual minister who does the duty is frequently not named, but the registration goes on in the lump, and all done is put down in some of the mother churches in the name of the district minister. This process, by identifying a party with a transaction who had no share in it, renders the entire act *illegal*, and conscientious incumbents ought not to sanction a positive untruth, a positive falsehood in the statement of facts; stating, for example, that A is buried by C, when he was so in effect by D.

With respect to the fourth point, "That church estates, due regard being had to the number of souls attached to such districts, be divided in proportions correspondent with their respective populations." Nothing can be more equitable than this measure, which has been adopted in Islington, and other large parishes, and to which the objection that they are left to one church, when but one church was standing, is too ridiculous to need refutation. The Islington churches now, we believe, enjoy a property divided among them all, or nearly so, that was originally left for but *one*—the mother church. To this church was left, we believe, property for *masses for the dead*; it became applied to the edification of the *living*, and was extended from this one to all: and so it should be in all instances. The Legislature has recognized this *cognate application*, and it is time that the principle, which would spare all the outcry at present raising in many a large community on the subject of church-rates, should at once be terminated. Does it follow that T leaving a property to A, which becomes immensely increased beyond what T anticipated,

and far exceeding all the purposes that T designed to effect with it, every pious wish of the testator's heart being more than accomplished, that the residue is not to be beneficially applied to some cognate object in the same community—a community vastly increased beyond any anticipations of the testator? What was done with the large sums left to redeem Christian captives from Algiers when there were no Christian captives to redeem? Why they were applied to a cognate object. This question, if examined fairly, would be found to embrace an immense fund, that, however at present misdirected, when properly applied, would be of immense benefit. But the endowment of the mother church will be diminished? Certainly, and so it ought, after she ceases to have the sole charge of her offspring, and other children come in to their own rights. All those unnatural positions, such as rectors of large parishes, with immense incomes, and, in addition, stalls in *distant* cathedrals, will of course in future be prevented, since they minister offence needlessly to the community. The Benefices Plurality Bill has checked the extension of these matters, and most wisely. That great difficulties lie in the way of this extensive plan is indubitable, but they are difficulties that are partially yielding to the pressure from without; some are already objects of legislative enactment, others must become so. We look forward to considerable mitigation of existing evils by the proper application and rapid increase of that Church society—the Curates Aid.

We have spoken strongly, because the subject is one of great importance, and because too many persons and too many parishes are suffering for it to remain as it is. That the present position of the district churches is anomalous, no one will deny; few even would hesitate to call it an abuse; but it is an abuse, the rectification of which, inasmuch as it has arisen from unavoidable causes, is and must be attended by difficulties of no ordinary character. These we shall now allude to, lest it should be said that we are writing as mere partizans, and are desirous to hasten precipitate changes.

The plan we have proposed requires, first, the consent of incumbents now living; and cannot be lawfully made without such consent, because, inasmuch as a living is property, and we would have many livings divided, we should be committing a gross and manifest injustice were we to recommend such separation without a sufficient remuneration to the present incumbent, or, at least, without his full and *ex-animo* consent. Again, the rights of *patrons* must be respected: they have in many, nay, in most cases, *purchased* the advowson. In all cases it is a positive property, bearing a strictly definable value; hence, too,

the patron has a clear right to be remunerated, if the division diminish (as in almost all cases it will do) the gross value of the property.

We mention these, and these are not all the difficulties, in order to show that, necessary as such changes are, they cannot be done all at once. The interests of the clergy are in good hands, and never had they more reason to put confidence in their spiritual leaders than at present. We would urge all those (and truly their name is legion) who are interested in the fate of the district churches, to act upon their parishioners and on laymen generally, more especially on members of both Houses of Parliament, and to circulate among such parties a knowledge of the *circumstances of the case*. Above all, we would say, avoid memorializing the bishops—the subject is one with which *they* are already well acquainted. It cannot but be painful to them to have a subject, all the bearings of which they know, pressed upon them, when they are already doing all they can to alleviate the evil, and when that all is, alas! so little. They cannot divide livings—they cannot separate church estates—they cannot compel the incumbents of vast parishes to keep a sufficient number of curates, even though non-resident. Let the clergy, then, carefully ascertain, before they appeal to the bishops, that their lordships have really the power, as they assuredly have the inclination, to rectify the existing abuses about which such appeals are made.

This topic reminds us of a subject on which, some time ago, we made some remarks—the proceeding, namely, of the Pastoral Aid Society. We objected, and objected in the mildest and gentlest way, to their lay committee and almost irresponsible secretaries—to their usurping the episcopal functions by examining candidates for orders and curacies, and to the general want of episcopal superintendence, *as such*. Our remarks, though made in a really favourable spirit towards the society, were not well received; and we now have unhappily proof enough before us, that they were nevertheless well-founded. When we speak of the want in this body of episcopal superintendence, *as such*, we say plainly, that in the dioceses of Winchester, Chester, Peterborough, Llandaff, Ripon, Bath and Wells, and Salisbury, we have no fault to find with their arrangements, for the prelates of those sees having announced *their* satisfaction, would make any dissatisfaction on our part absurd; but what we want is episcopal superintendence as a principle; we want to see *all* the bishops, *as bishops, ex officio* members of the managing committee. We want to see the archbishop applied to to act as president, and a rule passed that all differences arising from any arrangement of

the society referred to the bishops. We want to see laymen omitted from the committee, unless acceptable to the episcopal members. We want to see a less exclusive spirit manifested—more regard paid to the *case*, and less to the *applicant*. Then, if we see these changes take place, we will call the society a Church society. Now, we cannot *fully* agree to give it that title.

Our readers will say—why do you *now* introduce the Pastoral Aid Society? We do so because we have brought before us some cases, of what we cannot help thinking great mismanagement on their part. For instance, they have granted a sum to the incumbent of a district church, with an immense population, in order that he might have a curate; and at the end of the year they have withdrawn their grant, having first involved him in the necessity of an additional service, with great expense of gas fitting, lighting, firing, organist's salary, &c., from which they well knew that he could not and would not be relieved. Now this is not a single case, far from it; and we ask—is this fair? is it honourable? We do not say, is it kind—is it Christian—is it courteous? We do assert, that, wherever a grant is made by the Pastoral Aid Society, or any similar body, and that grant clogged with conditions, then, so long as those conditions are fulfilled, and so long as the alteration which they involve *must be continued*, so long ought the grant to remain.

To return to the question of dividing livings, we are well aware that, while it would be very advisable to separate into two or three, or even more, some immense parishes, and to divide the income of the incumbent to provide for the additional rectors or vicars, there are many cases where such division would be both useless and hurtful. We could name parishes—Lambeth, for instance—where the district churches are all good pieces of preferment; and where the greater the number of such churches, the greater their value. These cases call only for ecclesiastical freedom. We know, too, that it is by no means advisable to bring all benefices to one dead level; and that nothing can be more impolitic than the system, too much in vogue at present, to cut every remuneration down to the lowest possible rate. It would be very unfair to say, that because the rector of A receives 2,000*l.* per annum, therefore the rector of A is overpaid. The question is—does *Mr. B.* or *Mr. C.*, the individual incumbent, receive more money than his services are well worth? We are by no means advocates, therefore, of an indiscriminate equalization of Church livings; but in immense parishes, where the revenue is large, we would certainly, *when possible*, do as has been done at Winwick. A parish, for example, with nearly forty thousand inhabitants, and where the

rector's income is somewhere about 2,500*l.* per annum, and the rector only partially resident, we would, when a vacancy occurred, divide into five distinct benefices, and entail on each rector the necessity of having a curate. Thus, instead of *two* clergymen for the forty thousand souls, we should secure *ten*. Much has been done in the north of England by the Pastoral Aid Society and the Additional Curates Society.

The present is the only period, and if church extension be not carried out to the extent of Sir Robert Harry Inglis's proposal, we trust it will receive all aid, short of money, and that legislative enactments will be made to meet the pressing demands and exigencies of the period. The impetus of rushing ages is not unfelt by Rome. She keeps up to the spirit of the times in one sense, and all that she can do to accommodate her principles to periods she has always done; and O'Connell is invariably foremost in the van of progress, as well as agitation. The Dissenters are comparatively sunken to what they were—things are getting better understood by the community, and were Wesley or Whitefield now to arise, their followers would be few. Yet is there much weakness of position, many ancient restrictions, numerous inconveniences and anomalies, that a legislature only can redress. Well we know the present Cabinet, from their pure love of ancient institutes, will do all to make them valuable: no reformer equals the Conservative reformer, because it is his determination to separate the evil from the good judiciously, and not ruthlessly or carelessly—not sacrificing with the abolition of evil any portion of good, but, like the skilful surgeon, so dividing the parts, that the diseased is separated without a sacrifice of that which is sound. If the Church of England could stand as we have thus indicated, nothing in this world would approach her splendour or her purity. Based on the Rock of Ages; deriving her authority from the Bible; exhibiting her affinity to the features of the true Church, as there depicted; equal to the answering of all difficulties, logical and metaphysical; rising to the spirit of the times with Catholic diffusion of her light, yet above the spirit of the times in things holy; developing forth from God's law its adaptation to all the exigencies of men; with no unhappy defects in her temporal polity to obscure her spiritual efficiency—her sons numerous, loving, and beloved; informing masses with their nervous sense, their devoted energy; like her, has there been nothing human, and she would then exhibit the spectacle that angel eyes long for, but yet have never dwelt on—a pure community, sacrificing temporal possessions for the pure love of God; not saying, “I am rich, and increased with

goods, and have need of nothing," like the lukewarm, wealth-deadened Laodicean; but resplendent in the lustre of the ancient Church of Smyrna, with the witness of God, of greater glory than gilded altars, pouring forth from these shrines the awful sound—"I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty (but thou art *rich*); faithful unto death, I will give thee the crown of life."

ART. IX.—*Sir Robert Peel's Financial Statement in the House of Commons, March 11th, 1842.* London: Painter.

2. *Speech of Sir Robert Peel on the Corn Laws, in the House of Commons, on Feb. 9th, 1842.* London: Painter.

3. *Speeches in Parliament—Sessions 1840 and 1841.* London: Painter.

ONE of the most appalling evils which result from the continued bad government of a country is a general taste which it begets for excitement and agitation. Feeling dissatisfied and unhappy, men become constitutionally feverish and excitable, and, instead of confidence in the Administration existing in the minds of the governed, there is a restlessness and anxiety which are alike destructive to individual peace and national happiness. When this state of private and of public mind has existed for any length of time, the character of society becomes changed, and even those whose habits and feelings were all of a Conservative character are altered to those of a love for novelty and agitation. Men's minds become unintentionally impressed with the feeling that something must be *done*—that changes must be made—that progress cannot be effected without new organic laws and measures—and that, unless some great alterations infundamental institutions are proposed every session, the Government is stationary and indolent, or cowardly and lukewarm.

We are sorry to declare, but we deem it our duty to make the declaration, that a portion of the Conservative party in this country is at present affected with this moral disorder. After a lapse of twelve years, we once more behold a Conservative Government in office; but during those twelve years the country has been exposed to the evils which result from its government by men who have appealed to the passions, and not to the judgments, of those they have governed. The Papal emissary, O'Connell, who has shouted throughout the land "*agitate! agitate!*" has done so in Ireland with such effect as even to induce landed proprietors, learned lawyers, and country gentlemen, to

believe that there were some grounds for all this uproar. And in England, Wales, and Scotland, the Whig-Radical league men have got up such a hue and cry against the Corn and Provision Laws, as well as against other measures, that the Conservatives partly yield to the Subversives, and urge the necessity for doing all that is possible to please and satisfy the discontented.

This state of mind should not excite any surprise or despondency, but its evils should be pointed out, in order that they may be guarded against, and those who encourage it should be warned against the bad results which may follow their continuance in such a course.

During the twelve years of Whig-Radical Government with which this country has been afflicted, the fretful, feverish, anxious, unsettled state of mind which it engendered has become a national habit; and it is by no means astonishing that, after so long a period of perturbation, the feeling of restlessness should continue. Yet this is not Conservatism. In the Conservative spirit there is a feeling of quietness, repose, and of confidence in its own principles, and in their eventual triumph, not by means of agitation, but by the force of truth. Conservative principles are not opposed to improvements of a *practical* and sound character; but they are opposed to alterations which are sudden and unexamined, or which do not present the best possible prospect of sound and solid advantages by their adoption.

We have been led into this train of thought and observation by an article which has appeared in "Fraser's Magazine" for March, entitled "The Conservatives in Power," and we must enter our protest against the attack there made on Sir Robert Peel and his Government. We regret indeed that this course on our part appears to us to be specially called for, since in our January number, in an article entitled "The State of the Nation," we ventured to anticipate the line of policy and conduct which the Premier would adopt; and as in almost every point we have been essentially right, we shall now proceed to combat the attacks made on that policy and conduct by the Conservative magazine in question.

In much that is said in the *first* part of that article, in *commendation* of the Cabinet, we concur, although we are far from admitting "*the cleverness*" of the Ministry of Lord Melbourne which our contemporary claims for it. We have yet to learn that Lord Melbourne's Cabinet was even *clever*. Nor can we assent to the unwarrantable attack made on the Cabinet of Lord Liverpool for its alleged improper disposal of patronage, both as relates to the judicial and episcopal bench. And, finally, although our views as to the Tractarian heresy are well known,

we object to all accusations of want of sincerity and tergiversation, such as those brought against Dr. Hook and Dr. Jelf. Nothing can be less fair on the part of a critic than to select isolated sentences from a sermon, and found on them charges against the preacher.

In the commendations bestowed upon Lord Stanley we fully and heartily agree. His division of Winwick, in Lancashire, the great family living of the house of Derby, into five distinct incumbencies, each with its church, school, and parsonage, and each possessing a competent maintenance for its own pastor, is a fact which we record with pleasure, and hold up to Whig imitation.

But it is now time that we turn to the second branch of this article of our contemporary, as to what he styles "the less agreeable consideration of those things in which there is but too much reason to fear that the country will find itself to have derived but little advantage from the recent change."

This is a serious charge; the more so, as the writer follows it up by declaring "that these matters form but a single class, and all concern what we may term *great and important questions*."

So, then, the country has derived little advantage on all great and important questions from the recent change in the Government of the country?

The character of Sir Robert Peel is, of course, the first subject of attack; not his character as a man, as a member of parliament, but as a great and wise statesman. "The predominant feature in his character (we are told) is *caution*, and this appears to influence his whole Cabinet; and the result is, an indisposition to move in any direction beyond small and cautious modifications of admitted principles and existing laws."

What! and is *caution* to be held up as an unfortunate feature in the character of a great statesman? Have we not had enough, during the past twelve years, of votes of confidence, without grounds for the confidence voted; of votes of money without real, *bona fide*, indisputable estimates; and of votes of reduction in taxes, when the next year new deficiencies appeared in the treasury? Has not the want of caution led us into a war with China? into disputes with America and France? into a war with the Pacha of Egypt? into a war against our old ally, the King of Holland? into a most unfortunate and melancholy quadruple alliance, from which we have derived no other results than loss of money, glory, and honour? Has not the want of caution in our mad, *harem scarem* governors, for twelve years, brought upon us Chartism, Socialism, and Republicanism at home, and insurrection in many of our possessions

abroad? Has not this want of caution brought us to such a *financial* condition as to render it difficult to say whether some great change in the currency may not be essential to prevent threatening disasters? And yet, because Sir Robert Peel declines to follow the advice of *Mr. Radical Roebuck*, and “bring forward some grand and comprehensive scheme, that would stamp him with the character of a great statesman,” and prefers, to adopt his own words, “not to aspire to any of the magnificent characteristics which Mr. Roebuck had described, but to endeavour to effect as much *practical* good as he could,” the writer in question is in a towering passion, “and fears that the country will find itself to have derived but little advantage from the recent change!”

It happens, however, as generally is the case when clever men and notable writers adopt a false hypothesis, that a fact of some importance stood in the way of this same theory. And the fact was this, that Sir Robert Peel had contrived to settle, with great ability and tact, that most difficult of all questions, *the Corn Laws*. Our contemporary felt this difficulty, but, instead of meeting, has turned it! Without pointing out any other course which Sir Robert Peel might have taken—without showing in what respect a statesman, with less of caution and more of genius than he will admit Sir Robert to possess, might have overcome all difficulties by some grand and characteristic scheme, such as Mr. Roebuck alluded to, the writer of the article we are refuting ascribes even the settlement of the Corn Law question to the same mediocre and secondary talent of *caution*, and even ventures to declare “that the treatment of the corn question is an instance, and perhaps the most favourable instance, that can be adduced of this disposition” (*caution*).

Now really this is a little too bad. For though much has been said and written about the *difficulties* of the Corn Law question, they are not so overpoweringly difficult as to smite us to the earth. The general question is this:—Do we grow enough of corn in our own country for our own consumption?—and if we do, do we grow it at such a price, and obtain it at such a price, as to be profitable to the grower, and advantageous to the consumer? Some say yes; others say no. In order to bring this matter to a settlement, some propose that a fixed duty shall be laid on all foreign wheat, which, in bad harvests and good harvests, both at home and abroad, shall remain always the same. Others propose, in order to secure a fair price to the grower for his wheat, and a cheap loaf to the consumer, that the duty on foreign corn shall vary according to the average

price of wheat, from time to time, at all the great wheat markets throughout the country. Whilst a third set of individuals propose that there shall not be any duty on foreign corn at all, and that the wheat growers of England shall be left to compete as they can with the wheat growers of Prussia and Poland. The *second* class of individuals, though all adopting the sliding scale, are divided into two sects—those who, with Sir Robert Peel, are for protecting both manufacturing and agricultural interests, by lowering the duty; and those who, with the Duke of Buckingham, think that the present scale should be maintained, and agriculture be more protected.

Now, has the writer in question any other plan to propose—any other mode of settling the question, to submit to the decision of the public voice? It would seem not; for no other plan does he propose. What, then, would he have desired? Would he have wished Sir Robert Peel to have joined the Roebuck party, and proclaimed “a free trade in corn?” That would be far from him to desire. Then, was he disappointed that the Premier did not join the fixed duty question, and consent to throw us into the hands of jobbers in time of plenty, and of foreigners in time of scarcity? No; for he says, “We gladly declare, not only our assent to, but our admiration of, the plan for the settlement of this great controversy, which Sir Robert Peel has—it seems to us, with consummate skill—just propounded.” Nor would he, therefore, have joined the Duke of Buckingham’s party, and required greater protection to the agricultural interests than the measure of Sir Robert Peel will secure. Under these circumstances, then, we ask of this writer, what he can mean by accusing Sir Robert Peel’s measure of being destitute of every other feature than caution, and of being founded upon it, when he has no other measure to suggest than those which are known to the public, and when even he has gone the extent of declaring that he admires the plan for the settlement of the Corn Law question adopted by Sir Robert Peel, as one of *consummate skill* and *practical wisdom*?

Sir Robert is accused of an “habitual fondness for detail,” and for “*mere* practical improvements;” and, with reference to the Corn Law question, of reducing it to “mere matter of petty arrangement, an affair of scales and averages, and the safest course.” These are curious charges, to say the best of them, from the pen of a Conservative writer. Have we not had twelve years of sweeping charges, general statements, and assertions, without facts or figures to bear them out? Have we not, all of us, as Conservatives, habitually complained, during that

period, that the men who governed us were not governing men—that they knew nothing of details and facts, and that they spent the money of the country, as they spent their own funds, with folly and prodigality? And yet, now that we have practical men, who are practical in their measures and views, they are to be attacked for their “habitual fondness of detail.” And with respect to the Corn Law question, which Sir Robert Peel is accused of reducing “to a mere matter of petty arrangement, an affair of scales and averages, and the safest course,” how could he alter the character of the question, and make it other than what it was? The great question, of whether the agricultural interests of the country were or were not to be protected against the free admission of foreign corn, Sir Robert Peel had long since decided; and the vote on the free trade amendment has shown that the House of Commons fully concurs in that decision. The Corn Law question was, in fact, reduced to one of “scales and averages, and the safest course,” and Sir Robert Peel could not change it. Those who, like Mr. Roebuck, wished to alter the question to some “comprehensive scheme,” proved that they did not understand the matter, and were anxious to hide their ignorance by general terms and sweeping charges. The vote on the free trade proposition has demonstrated that Whigs as well as Tories are still resolved on deciding in the affirmative the question, whether our agricultural interests are to be protected by the laws of the land. The question, then, was reduced to the narrow bounds of “what degree of protection should be afforded, and whether in the form of a fixed duty or of a sliding scale.” Sir Robert Peel decided for the latter, and his “fondness for detail,” and love “of mere practical improvements,” assisted him in producing a measure which has been received with general and well-merited applause.

Sir Robert Peel is also accused of an “aversion to large measures.” This again is a sweeping and an unjust censure. What were his improvements and changes in the criminal laws?—were these small and petty matters of detail? What was his Police Bill?—was that a mere matter of petty detail? What was his Roman Catholic Relief Bill?—we say nothing of its *wisdom*; but, at least, it was a large measure, if it was not a good one. During the last twenty-five years, the name of Sir Robert Peel has been associated with all the large measures which have been adopted by the Legislature; and although nothing is more easy than to talk, in the *grandiloquent* style of the Roebuck school, about great and comprehensive measures, yet any statesman, who should in this country be destitute of the love of detail, and

of a fondness for "mere practical improvements," so much censured in the present Premier, would find that his plans would be rejected by a discerning and enquiring public.

It may perhaps seem strange to some readers that we should, contrary to the usual rule in such cases, devote an article to the lucubrations of a contemporary periodical; but we do so, not because we attach any peculiar importance to the paper in question, but because it may be taken as a fair exponent of the opinions professed by a certain class of Conservatives. We remark on the remarks, not because the remarks are new, but because they are not new—not because they are original, but because they are borrowed, and because they are borrowed from a class that stands greatly in need of enlightenment.

The writer, then, in "Fraser" we take as the representative of that portion of the Conservative body who are dissatisfied with Sir Robert Peel; and we take him the rather, because, when we object to certain views, we would rather use the words of those who hold them than our own in representing such opinions.

The article in question states, that the "aversion to large measures," on the part of Sir Robert Peel, "pervades his whole system, and causes a shrot coming in several matters wherein extensive and vigorous measures are greatly needed." This is another sweeping charge; but as our contemporary has at least attempted to substantiate it by five distinct cases, we shall proceed to follow him in his enquiries.

FIRST, the FACTORY QUESTION. Our critic says that this "was a subject in which boldness, and a manly determination to do justice to the working classes, would have been the truest wisdom—the 'safest course' that could have been taken." Sir Robert Peel is accused of not having taken this "safest course;" but, "after sundry interviews with the delegates of the working classes, of having taken the *weak and unworthy resolve* to do just what the Whigs themselves would have done—to tinker and cobble up the existing law—to make a few practical improvements in its details, but to refuse the chief petition of the work people—that, in fact, upon which the whole prospect of amelioration depended, a restriction of the hours of labour for all persons under the age of eighteen.....The working classes are again repelled; and we fear that the effects of this most impolitic rejection of their claims will one day be deeply regretted by those who have resolved upon it."

We will certainly not yield to any writers for our love of, and sympathy with, the working classes. We are decided friends to a legislative restriction of the hours of labour for all persons

under the age of eighteen ; and we wish abundant success to the philanthropic and zealous efforts of Lord Ashley. But when the individuals who obtained an interview with the Premier are represented as “the delegates of the working classes,” we reply that they were unentitled to that honour ; and when it is declared that a “weak and unworthy resolve was adopted by the Government to tinker and cobble up” the existing law, we add, that the writer also ought to have been aware that no such resolution had been taken. That Sir James Graham and Sir Robert Peel may feel that Lord Ashley and his friends desire a greater legislative interference with the independence of free labour than they are prepared to make, is very probably the case ; but they have no desire either to avoid the discussion of the whole question, or to come to a fair, open, and manly decision. Neither Sir Robert Peel nor Sir James Graham wish to drive “*a hard bargain*” with the working classes, or to cut down the demands made in their behalf by their wise and enlightened champion, Lord Ashley ; but they feel that the question, of how far the Legislature should decide as to the *quantum* of labour to be voluntarily performed by persons of an age to decide for themselves what is proper and suitable for them, is one which demands much consideration, and even some delay. And although we are prepared to go along with Lord Ashley, and to vote with him, we are not disposed to regard the Premier and his coadjutors as enemies to the working classes, and as wanting either in wisdom or in tact, because they ask for time. Sir Robert Peel has endeavoured, in the question of the Corn Laws, to protect the interests of the agriculturist, and yet to secure a cheap loaf to the general consumer. He is anxious, likewise, with this factory question, to protect the interests of the master manufacturers, whilst he prevents the working classes from being oppressed by over labour. This is falsely styled “a most impolitic rejection of the claims of the working classes.” It is no such thing. Those claims will be fully investigated, and as fully adjusted, by the present Conservative Cabinet : for it is a gratuitous assumption on the part of any body to suppose that the Conservatives have resolved on turning a deaf ear to the claims and desires of the working classes.

The SECOND charge against Sir Robert Peel’s Government arises out of the NEW POOR LAW. “Here we have an exactly similar mistake. No one required of Sir Robert Peel, who had given his support to the original bill, to recall his opinion, and to promise, in general terms, to rescind the measure.”

But why not ? The measure has worked well, or ill. Which has it done ? We have had many years’ experience, and it is

time to come to a decision. Sir Robert Peel voted for the measure as a great experiment, which promised well; but if he, like multitudes of others, has been disappointed, why should he not avow it? We have a much higher opinion of that statesman than has this writer; for we believe that if he were convinced that the measure, *as a whole*, had worked ill, he would be the first to propose its repeal. But if Sir Robert Peel has *not* come to such a conclusion—if he still adheres to the principle of the original measure—if he thinks that, by attention to the “*details*” of the measure in its working, he can propose and carry some “practical improvements,” which will remedy the evils of which the poor and the public generally complain—we ask, if this be the case, is Sir Robert Peel to be expected, in order to gratify the impatience of some, and the prejudices and passions of others, to come down during the first month of the present session, and propose a repeal of the Poor Laws? And yet, because Sir Robert has not pursued this course, he is accused of wanting large and comprehensive views, which will lead the public to perceive that they have gained nothing by the recent Government changes! For the writer himself is obliged to avow, that the intentions of the Government are not known; and that “not one word had fallen from the lips of any member of the Cabinet, conveying any hopes to the anxious ears of the people. All has been cold, repulsive, obdurate. This is most unwise. We will not look upon the mischief as yet perpetrated; but if this spirit be doggedly maintained, we shall begin to despair of the Conservative cause.”

This is a striking specimen of the evil we exposed and deplored in the commencement of this article, as one which resulted from a long period of bad government. The minds of men become habitually feverish, excited, impatient, and unless each week produces its prodigy, they think nothing is doing—that all is standing still—and that the movement will commence from the opposite quarter. Here is a Conservative actually in a rage with Sir Robert—quite indignant and horror-struck, because, in less than one month after the assembling of Parliament, the Government had not announced an intention of “restoring to parishes, having populations of 2,000 and upwards, the power to dispose of their own poor after their own wishes.” But what and if the Government is not convinced of the wisdom and expediency of such a measure—is it still to propose it? Oh yes! because that would be a grand and comprehensive measure, and would not be based on Sir Robert’s customary “caution,” but would prove that he had no longer an “aversion to large measures.”

The Poor Law question is by far the most difficult which the

Government has to decide upon. The machinery of the present system has cost immense sums of money—the mere erection of the union-houses has been a work of vast labour and expense—the parishes through the country are classified into districts—the old divisions are destroyed—an entirely new system is in active operation—and a wise and enlightened Government will hesitate a long while before it proposes such a sweeping change as that here suggested—even though, by doing so, it should succeed in obtaining the reputation of being a Government capable of proposing “large measures” and “comprehensive schemes.”

We are not friends to the present Poor Law system, and greatly do we desire *many* changes; but our Conservatism teaches us to have patience, to approve caution, to know and feel how much depends upon practical improvements, and to estimate a Government which thinks before it proposes, and examines before it acts. We must protest also against the assumption that “the people have a right to manage their own poor after their own ideas,” as containing in it as many fallacies as there are letters in the phrase. The people, in a regular and legal society, have no rights but those which the laws confer, when those laws, as in Great Britain, are made by their representatives. The people, then, have no right to manage their own poor in any other way, or according to any other ideas, than in the way, and according to the ideas, pointed out by the law. Now the law in England at present is clear and positive, and until the Legislature shall alter it, it must be enforced. As to the ideas entertained by the people respecting the poor and their management, we know them to be most various. Some are in favour of this, and others of that system, but the majority of rate-payers in each parish would perhaps adopt, according to their degree of knowledge and experience, different plans. These plans would, in some cases, be most oppressive to the agricultural interests, and, in others, most injurious to the poor. The Legislature should decide on these events, and the poor ought not to be left to “the ideas” of the people.

The THIRD charge brought against the Government of Sir Robert Peel is with reference to CHURCH QUESTIONS, and especially with regard to the MEANS of CHURCH EXTENSION.

We have not to declare for the first time our opinions on Church extension. They are well known, and have undergone no change. The writer to whom we allude is right, when he says of the Church of England:—

“Nothing can be imagined more preposterous than her present predicament, if she is to be regarded as a national establishment. In every other department—the army, the navy, the law—an augmentation

of duty, of need, always ensures an immediate augmentation of strength. If affairs in Canada, or northern India, seem warlike, the Government, whether Whig or Tory, instantly comes down to Parliament with a proposition for an addition of 5,000 or 10,000 men. Does the business of the Common Law Courts increase, and fall into arrears, forthwith our twelve judges are increased to fifteen, and the Barons of the Exchequer are called on to undertake more arduous and regular duty.....In short, turn where we will, the obvious common sense principle is everywhere acknowledged of increased power to meet increased duties—*except in the case of the Church!*”

The whole of these observations and statistics on the question of Church extension are well worthy of perusal; but it is not to the premises, but to the conclusion, we object. Because Sir Robert Peel, Lord Stanley, Sir James Graham, and Mr. Goulburn, supported by their votes, in June, 1840, the motion of Sir R. H. Inglis for an address to the Crown, and which motion was only lost by a majority of 19, the writer in “Fraser” maintains that the subject of Church extension ought to have occupied “its fit and rightful place in a speech prepared for her Majesty by these very men.”

Now really, if statesmen are to be required on their accepting office, not merely to support, when in office, all that they voted for when not in power, however great may have been intermediate changes, and notwithstanding a great variety of new facts may have transpired to change their views as to the opportuneness of the measures, but are moreover to be pledged, by the mere fact of their accepting office, to bring forward all those measures as Government measures, not only during the first session of Parliament which shall occur after their accepting office, but *also* to mention them specifically in the speech from the throne at the opening of that session, there would soon not be found men who would consent to accept office upon such conditions. And we say this not merely in the interest of the Conservatives now in power, but as much likewise of the Whigs now in opposition. It will doubtless happen frequently to the chief of that opposition (Lord John Russell) to vote, whilst in opposition, in behalf of propositions which shall be brought forward by the Government of Sir Robert Peel; but it would be absurd, therefore, to expect from him, that, should he again become a member of a Whig Administration, he should bring forward as Government measures, those for which he had previously voted. Nor, in our opinion, is the principle for which we are contending at all changed by the fact that Sir Robert Harry Inglis was a Conservative, and brought forward, as a Con-

servative, his Church extension project. It is well known, to all who are not grossly ignorant of Parliamentary votes and parties, that Sir Robert Inglis brought forward that measure rather against than with the approbation of the chiefs of the Conservatives; but when the proposition was brought forward, and it became necessary either to affirm or negative its facts and its arguments, Sir Robert Peel, Lord Stanley, Sir James Graham, and Mr. Goulburn could not do otherwise than vote in their favour. Yet we maintain, that if at that moment these gentlemen had been asked, in their places in the house, whether, in the event of their attaining office, they would pledge themselves to introduce it as a Government measure with the first speech from the throne after their accession, they would all have unhesitatingly stated, that they would by no means pledge themselves to such a proceeding.

And, independent of every other consideration, they would have refused so to pledge themselves, on the ground of their ignorance as to what might be the state of the treasury on their being named Ministers. They would have said—"How can we tell what may then be the state of our financial affairs? We may have a war in India, and a war in China, to provide for; our armies may have received serious checks, and it may become necessary greatly to increase our forces. How, then, can we pledge ourselves beforehand as to the course we shall think fit to take respecting a demand on the public treasury for Church extension?" And now, in fact, that which they might have said has really occurred: there is a great deficiency in the treasury, and there are vast new demands upon it. Financially speaking, nothing can be less propitious than the present moment for the accomplishment of the plan we have so much at heart, in common with Sir Robert Inglis and with the clergy of the land. Sir Robert Peel knew this when he prepared the Queen's speech; and it was because he knew it that Church extension was not mentioned specifically in the speech with which the session was opened. When Sir Robert Peel prepared that speech he was also ignorant as to the course which the Houses of Parliament might think fit to take relative to the Corn Laws, and other fiscal and financial measures yet to be submitted to them; and without a knowledge of those decisions, it would indeed have exhibited a want of caution and of skill if he had gone down to Parliament, on the first day of the session, and demanded a vote for Church extension, as a Government measure.

But does it follow, from what has been stated, that Sir Robert Peel, Lord Stanley, Sir James Graham, and Mr. Goulburn, who

affirmed by their votes, in 1840, the proposition of Sir R. H. Inglis, would vote against the *principle* of that vote in 1842? Certainly not. Even our contemporary says—

“We cannot, indeed, entertain the least fear, that when this very resolution is once more offered to the house, these eminent men will again give their votes in its favour—indeed, to doubt this would be to suspect four of the first men in the country of sheer scoundrelism.”

If this be the case, then why should a subject, which has been specially under the care and watchfulness of Sir R. H. Inglis during many years, be taken out of his hands, when success is sure to crown, at least, in a session or two, his long and noble efforts? There are many reasons why it would be desirable that this measure of Church extension should proceed from Parliament, and arise and spring out of Parliament, rather than be the work of the Queen's Government. Its popularity would be greater, the sum voted by Parliament would be larger, and the Church would itself be consoled and cheered by this voluntary proof of Parliament that it identified itself with the prosperity and extension of the Church of England. We would much rather that Church extension were carried as a Parliamentary than as a Government measure, the Government, however, aiding it by its influence, and rejoicing in its success. This is, doubtless, the course which the Premier also would prefer; for sure we are, that, whenever the opportunity shall be afforded to the present Conservative Government to express its opinions and wishes on this question, they will be frankly and warmly expressed in favour of the measure. At the same time, we cannot lead our friends to expect, that, in the present state of the treasury, and with new claims for the wars both in China and India, the grant in favour of Church extension can possibly be a large one. We are more anxious that the *principle* of Parliamentary grants in favour of the national Church should be again affirmed by Parliament, than we are careful respecting a large grant at the present moment. For twelve years the Whig-Radicals have done all they could to separate the State from the Church; but the Conservatives, now they are in power, seek to re-establish that union.

We protest, then, against the conclusions of our contemporary with reference to the supposed conduct of Government, relative to the Church extension question, when he says—

“We are, we regret to say, compelled to note down this shortcoming among the other points to which we have alluded, or shall presently describe, as betokening an indisposition to take any bold and decisive step, either for good or ill; an indisposition, in fact, to go in

any direction beyond mere '*practical improvements*,' committing the proposers to no principle whatever."

The repeated calls for "bold and decisive steps," made by such writers, are not in unison with the prudent and considerate conduct which Conservatives should ever display. A government which is truly Conservative has other virtues to cultivate, and other principles to be guided by, than those of courage and decision. In the defence of great principles and measures it should display courage and energy; but it would be as monstrous for a government to be ever boasting of its determination and courage, as it would for a private individual to enforce all his opinions upon others with blows and threats. A government should doubt and hesitate, examine and ponder, take time and delay, as well as should a private individual; and indeed much more so, since to it are entrusted the interests and happiness of millions. But writers such as these would reduce all the virtues of a government to two—decision and courage. These, however, are not sufficient; and we are convinced that not only the country generally, but the true and best friends of the Church especially, will approve the reserve, as to the mode and manner, time and season, of forwarding Church extension, maintained by Sir Robert Peel.

The FOURTH charge brought against Sir Robert Peel and his Cabinet is connected with the case of the CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

"The case of the Church of Scotland is, we fear, still worse; worse for all parties—for the Church herself, and for the Government which hesitates to do its duty. The danger of the English Establishment is merely a distant one; it is, that if not enabled to advance with the advancing wants of the nation, she must sooner or later become justly chargeable with inefficiency, and be liable to be condemned for not rightly discharging her high office. But in Scotland the peril is far greater, more immediate, and more alarming. The most earnest endeavours of a Conservative Government ought to be put forth, at this moment, to rescue the Church of Scotland, if it be yet possible, from the impending danger."

We are by no means indifferent to the important contest now going on between the patrons of livings in Scotland on the one hand, and the General Assembly, or presbyteral Church, on the other; and joyfully should we listen to any measure which could secure the rights of the one, without levelling a direct blow against the ecclesiastical influence of the other. But though the writer in question declares that he will not enter into the particulars of this controversy, it is evident that he is much more anxious for preserving the dignity and influence of the General

Assembly than he is for maintaining intact the rights of the patrons, confirmed as they have been by the decisions of the courts of law. It is much to be deplored that the Church and the law should be in opposition; but, highly as we respect many of the ministers of that communion, we do not hesitate to declare that the law must triumph. What would that establishment herself say, if any other decision were come to? Would she not have the right to apprehend that at some future time, when the decisions of the courts of law should be in her favour, the Government would not enforce its verdicts and judgments? Indeed she would be without security if the State permitted the decisions of the law against her to be resisted with impunity. We were rejoiced, therefore, to learn, from the replies of the Lord Advocate, as well as of the Home Secretary, to questions put to them relative to the removal of troops to a district in Scotland, where resistance was anticipated to a presentee of a patron objected to by the inhabitants, that the law was to be enforced—that opposition to the law was not to be tolerated—and that the Government would no longer be a party to any implied doubt as to the triumph of the law.

But our critic has a new and ingenious method of settling the controversy. It is by purchase. The patronage is to be bought. The decisions of the courts of law are to be passed over, and the resolutions of the General Assembly are to be practically confirmed. “The settlement of the Slavery question (says this writer) cost twenty millions; but for half a million the Church of Scotland controversy may be decided. Buy up the patronage, and leave to Parliament to decide what shall be the regulations for the future filling up of vacant churches.” But when once this concession should be made to the General Assembly, who will guarantee that the General Assembly would accept the regulations which Parliament may impose for the filling up of the livings to be purchased by the Government of the patrons? Thus the difficulty would not be overcome, but merely adjourned. Our critic exclaims, when speaking of the half million of pounds sterling, which in his opinion would be sufficient to settle the controversy—

“And what are we to think of any government that can lack the courage to adopt a course which would tranquillize a kingdom at so low a price?” To which we reply, and what would be thought of a government that would step in between the decisions of the courts of law and the rights of Church patrons on one side, and the arbitrary decisions of the General Assembly on the other, resolved on resisting law simply to maintain its own decisions, setting at nought the law and the rights of the patrons,

and reducing those rights to a mere pecuniary consideration? Our answer is clear—such a government would forfeit the respect of all who loved the constitution of their country and the rights of its free inhabitants. No! the law must be enforced, even at the risk of compelling the General Assembly to rescind its resolutions.

“But (says the writer we quote) this would not be the result; the result would be to destroy the Church of Scotland, and to leave a nation, calling itself Christian, without any Church at all.” More than this—he “apprehends that the destruction of the Church of Scotland would soon be followed up by a loud demand for Church destruction in England and in Ireland too.” Now, although we acknowledge that we view with deep regret and unfeigned sorrow the conflict still going on in Scotland, we cannot consent to attach to it an undue importance. If the Kirk of Scotland shall be destroyed, it will be her own fault, or at least the fault of her ministry. They oppose the law, refuse to obey the law, and set at defiance the law. If an obstinate perseverance in this line of conduct shall lead some thousands of the members of that communion rather to quit her pale than to change their decisions, and thus to become Dissenters from the Presbyterian establishment of Scotland, we do not fear that the clergy of the episcopal Church of England will imitate their example. They know and feel that the only security, both to civil and ecclesiastical interests and power, is obedience to the laws, and they will not adopt the Presbytery of Scotland as their model in matters of obedience or discipline.

We hope, then, that Sir Robert Peel will not adopt the advice given by these writers; for, much as we respect Chalmers and Gordon, and other men of rank and learning, who advocate the views taken by the General Assembly, we are satisfied that in this matter, at least, they are faulty, and that the first duty of a clerical as of a lay teacher of the Church of Scotland, next to his obedience to the laws of God, is his obedience to the laws of the land. No: Sir Robert Peel has not merely acted with caution, but with wisdom, when he has refused to espouse, directly or indirectly, the cause of the General Assembly. The Premier is no friend to the violation of the laws—no recognizer of the principle, that one party in a dispute has the right of deciding the points in controversy in his own favour; and will certainly stand by the laws and by their constitutional interpreters, the judges of the land, even at the risk of being accused of wanting courage and energy.

The LAST charge brought against Sir Robert Peel and his Administration has reference to the subject of THE CURRENCY.

We agree with the writer, that nothing can be more untrue or unprincipled than to ascribe the present depression in trade and commerce to the existence of the Corn Laws, now about to be modified, since these laws have existed in their present shape for more than fourteen years; and even so recently as 1836 those who now declare the country to be in a state of bankruptcy, then asserted that it was in a condition of "great prosperity." But we cannot agree with this writer, that to the state of the currency is to be ascribed the present distress in our manufacturing districts. According to his theory, the greater the amount of paper issues, the greater the amount of prosperity. If this were the case, how was it that the prosperity of the country in 1818, when the paper currency was 47,727,000*l.*, was not to be compared to its prosperity in 1836, when (in July) it was only 30,101,196*l.*? The "point of comfort," it would seem, is just 30,000,000*l.* of paper circulation, and when there are two or three millions less than this afloat, all is misery and stagnation. True, indeed, in January last, the paper money then in circulation in England and Wales was only 24,800,000*l.*, or 5,200,000*l.* below "the point of comfort;" and to this is ascribed the misery we now see and deplore.

But what has the Government of Sir Robert Peel to do with this? we should ask of this writer, if we knew him. "Nothing (he would reply), as far as the past is concerned, but everything with reference to the future."

"As we have already said, it is a very doubtful question whether any Government can keep its ground in such a state of things; whether any Government can bear up against the complainings and discontent which a low currency inevitably produces. As far as experience goes, it is quite against any such expectation."

That the bad government of the last twelve years has been the chief cause of our present disasters, we are willing to admit; but we are firm foes to all tampering with the currency. In nine cases out of ten the currency, like the nation, will right itself if left to itself. We cannot, therefore, agree with our contemporary in the following description of the reasons which led to the changes of the Governments in 1822 and 1830; nor do we apprehend that the present state of our monetary system will lead to the overthrow of the present Conservative Administration. "Fraser" says—

"In 1822 the Government was forced to give way, and to give further latitude to the small notes. In 1830, taking no remedial step, the Government itself was upset, and the constitution with it. We are now in a greater difficulty than we were either in 1822 or 1830;

and it may well be doubted whether a government which *proposes nothing* will be able to maintain its ground."

Then what was Sir Robert Peel to do, to satisfy the writer in question, and the party, or section of the party, approving his opinions? To attack the joint stock banks, which are accused of alternately augmenting and reducing the notes in circulation for their own convenience? Or to attack the Bank of England, which, in consequence of three bad harvests succeeding each other, has been obliged to diminish its issues, in order that they may bear a just relation to the diminished amount of bullion in its hands? No: Sir Robert Peel can do neither. He will not, he cannot, be indifferent to so vast a subject as the currency; but he must have breathing time—he must watch the effect of the very measures he is bringing under the consideration of Parliament. He must provide for the deficiency in the treasury, and for new taxes to meet new deficiencies, as well as to supply new ways and means for an Indian and a Chinese war. To tamper with the currency at such a moment would neither prove caution or wisdom, but madness.

We have arrived at the closing paragraph of the article to which we have devoted so many of our pages; but before we extract it, and offer some observations, we consider it due to ourselves, and to the work of which we are its conductors, as well as to our readers, both lay and clerical, to state why we have occupied so large a space with a review of "Fraser's" article on the "Conservatives in Power." We have, then, so acted, not merely because we think the article in question is likely to do harm, but principally because it is the expression of the feelings of dissatisfaction and impatience of the impetuous and sanguine portion of the Conservative party, who expect or hope that, now the Conservatives are in office, all evils are to be at once removed, and all good is to be at once attained. To this party we wish to say, "Have patience! Give time! Confide in your own principles, as well as in your own leaders! Do not imagine that the evils of twelve years are to be corrected in twelve weeks. And, above all, keep your impatience and fretfulness to yourselves—do not exhibit them before your opponents, and thus give the enemy reason to rejoice."

The charges brought by "Fraser" we have heard elsewhere. The young members and young men at the clubs—the daily writers in the press—and some philosophers of a *juvenile* date, are likewise the accusers of the new Government. The charges brought by all are, however, the same, and in answering "Fraser," we have replied to the whole of its opponents.

To the concluding paragraph of "Fraser" we now direct the attention of our readers. It is as follows :—

"We feel guiltless of any injustice towards the present Government, whose entire success and long continuance in power we earnestly desire. At the same time, we cannot conceal our grief at their lack of courage, and of a lofty and yet kind feeling towards the people—lofty, as to personal consequences to themselves; kind, as to the real wants and unquestionable sufferings which the working classes are now enduring. We cannot be more certain of any one thing than we are of this, that their '*safest*' course might be that which would seem the '*boldest*.'"

Thus, to the last, Sir Robert Peel is accused of "lack of courage," as well as of wanting "a lofty yet kind feeling towards the people." If we had read such charges in "Tait's Magazine," or in the *Nonconformist*, we should have either shrugged our shoulders or laughed outright. But that in Conservative periodical such an attack should have been made on the at once ablest and kindest-hearted statesman of the day, did excite no less our surprise than our grief and disappointment. These are, however, but a portion of the ills to which those who take upon themselves the ungrateful task of governing society are exposed. Prudence is called cowardice—caution is styled weakness—conscientious conduct is mistaken for a want of a great mind, and of commanding notions and principles; and so rapid is the transition from words to actions in the public mind, that the Minister who is to-day borne to power and office by the popular voice, is to-morrow assailed as cowardly, and overthrown as weak and irresolute. But truth comes out at last victorious from the conflict. Time—that great revealer of truth as well as of falsehood—will secure justice to even the most calumniated; and time will prove that the Conservatives, who are now in power, and now at work, are the real friends and the best defenders of the working classes.

And, indeed, may we not ask with confidence of the critic in "Fraser," and of all fretful or impetuous Conservatives, whether time has not already proved that the charges brought against the Ministry of Sir Robert Peel are baseless? May we not point with confidence to the manly, bold, and statesmanlike views and measures announced and proposed in the financial projects of the Government? Do not all the charges made by lukewarm friends and by open foes "melt into thin air" when brought into contact with those projects and statements? Sir Robert Peel's political enemies, themselves being judges, have been compelled to admit that a more lucid speech, or bolder and more

•

energetic measures and plans, were never delivered in, and submitted to the consideration of, Parliament.

Will the writer in "Fraser," and other fretful and impatient Conservatives, ascribe to the financial policy of the Government the sole characteristic of caution? Was it a *mere* cautious policy which led Sir Robert Peel and his coadjutors to look full in the face the financial difficulties of the country, and with a deficiency of ten millions of pounds sterling, including the anticipated deficiency for 1843, to provide for, not to hesitate to come down to Parliament and say, this deficiency must be met, or I cannot pretend to conduct the affairs of Government?

Was it only a sentiment of caution which induced him to declare, that "any such plan as that proposed by the late Government, or any other plan for raising the revenue by diminishing taxation, would not afford any immediate relief for the supply of any present deficiency?" Was not this a bold, manly, statesmanlike declaration, opposed to the shuffling and postponing policy of the late Administration?

And what is the character of his rational and wise measure of an income tax of 2*l.* 18*s.* 4*d.* per cent.? Is that *cautious* and timid, too? Has not Sir Robert Peel, by this measure, from which he has exempted all incomes under 150*l.* from duty, proved that he sympathizes with the working classes, and feels rightly and warmly for those who are unable to support additional taxation, whilst he requires those who partake of increased comfort and enjoyment, prosperity and wealth, to contribute of their abundance to the present financial deficiencies? The following extract from the concluding portion of his speech is eminently entitled to attention, respect, and deference:—

"You will bear in mind that there are indications amongst all the upper classes of society of increased comfort and enjoyment—of increased prosperity and wealth; and that, concurrently with these indications, there exists a mighty evil, which has been growing up for the last seven years, and which you are now called upon to meet. If you have, as I believe you have, the fortitude and constancy of which you have been set the example, you will not consent, with folded arms, to view the annual growth of this mighty evil; you will not reconcile it to your consciences to hope for relief from diminished taxation; you will not adopt the miserable expedient of adding, during peace, and in the midst of these indications of wealth and of increasing prosperity, to the burdens which posterity will be called upon to bear; you will not permit this evil to gain such gigantic growth as ultimately to place it far beyond your power to check or control."

This was not the language of an over-cautious or timid Admi-

nistration, but of one resolved on doing its duty to all ranks of the community.

And was it an evidence of over *caution* on his part which led Sir Robert Peel to declare that he would not resort to *loans* to cover the deficiency? If he had wished to curry favour with the great mass of the unthinking and unwise portion of the population, might he not have gained that popularity, which is always awarded to those who meet deficiencies by loans and other temporary expedients, by a similar proposal? But no; Sir Robert Peel's Administration seeks not to obtain that bubble reputation which exists but for the moment, preferring that enduring and permanent applause and gratitude which will be conferred in the end on wise and statesmanlike measures.

If Sir Robert Peel had been *merely* the cautious Minister—if he had not proposed large and great views of finance—and if he had not sought the welfare of the mass of the people, how different would have been his financial projects! With one hand he might have signed contracts for new loans, and with the other appeared to act liberally by the reduction of taxes. But what would have been the end thereof? Increased deficiencies, and new permanent drawbacks on the resources of the country.

The proposal to establish an *income tax* was not only a wise, but likewise a bold measure, with reference to those to whom he addressed himself for its adoption. His hearers, his judges, those who were to decide on the proposition, were the aristocracy of the country. The democracy were to be exempted from the operation of the tax. All the labourers, all the agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing working classes, all who do not receive an income of 150*l.*, are to be exempted. Thus those who really possess, are to contribute of their abundance; and those who possess not, are not to be subject to the new burden, which must of necessity be imposed on the affluent and the privileged. Will the Chartists call this *class legislation*? They cannot do so. Such measures as this, on the contrary, will secure to the Government the gratitude and affection of the mass of the people.

If we glance at the statements made by Sir Robert Peel with regard to Indian finance, we shall perceive the same boldness, the same statesmanlike daring, the same vigorous plan of laying the axe to the root of the tree, and the same system of probing the sore, the wound, most effectually and decisively. He has shown how the surplus revenue of India in 1836 became, in less than six years, a very large deficiency; since in the former year the surplus of Indian revenue over the expenditure was 1,550,000*l.*, whilst in 1841 there was no less a deficiency of

revenue to meet the expenditure than 2,324,000*l*. Sir Robert did not keep back any of these facts, appalling and novel as they were to the majority of his hearers, and to the country generally, but he called on the house to remember, that if British power in India was to be maintained, British wealth must also be brought to bear on British influence.

How different would have been the language of a Whig or a Whig-Radical minister, placed in a condition similar to that in which the Conservative Government is now placed, if required to present to Parliament its financial projects ! How it would have kept back such facts and figures as would have alarmed the aristocracy ! How it would have exaggerated the probable income of the country arising from diminished taxation, estimating the *extra consumption* of articles, the taxes on which should be reduced, at a most absurd increase ! How it would have pleaded for a re-issue of exchequer bills, for resorting to the resources of savings' banks, and even for new loans ! Afraid to look in the face the evils which Sir Robert Peel meets by bold and decisive measures, it would have resorted to any expedient to gain time, and postpone the evil day of reckoning. Instead of such schemes of bankruptlike postponement, Sir Robert reminded the House of Commons that it was *pledged* to make good the deficiency arising from the falling off of the post-office revenues. "I told you (he said) *not* to give that pledge ; but you would not listen to my advice. The pledge was given, and now it must be redeemed." He reminded the house, too, of another pledge it had made—of another promise it had entered into, of a yet larger and more important character, viz., the resolution it had come to, as one of the first votes of Parliament after the election, "that it would apply itself to the consideration of the finances, and take some measure for equalizing the revenue and the expenditure." And did Sir Robert Peel allow Parliament to forget this promise, and to postpone indefinitely the realization of this engagement ? Unquestionably not ; for he has required it to effect the very object it pledged itself to accomplish.

And if we look to that feature of the plan of Sir Robert Peel which relates to the means for supplying the deficiency in the revenue, we shall perceive the same boldness and total freedom from all exaggerated prudence or caution of which he has been unjustly accused :—

"If, then, (he said) it is necessary for me to have fresh taxation, shall I lay it upon articles of subsistence—upon those articles which may appear to some superfluities, but which are now become almost the necessities of life ? I cannot consent to increase the taxation upon

articles of subsistence, consumed by the great body of the labouring portion of the community. I think that you have had conclusive proof, that you have arrived at the limits of profitable taxation on articles of subsistence. I advise you not to increase taxation in that respect; for if you do, most assuredly you will be defeated in your object."

Surely, after such language as this, the author of the article in "Fraser" will deeply regret his own *want of caution*. If he had waited another month he would have saved the Government the pain of reading, and himself the annoyance of having penned such a criticism. The part of a true Conservative, with regard to a right-thinking and well-intentioned government, is at least to exercise great reserve with regard to its acts and projects.

And now, if we turn to the various plans suggested for increasing the revenue of the country by those who hold different political opinions to those of Sir Robert Peel, we shall still find how superior are those which *he* has proposed, and which will, no doubt, be carried into effect. One says, "Increase your unfunded debt." "You must fund it hereafter (replies Sir Robert Peel), or leave to posterity to do that which you are bound to do yourselves." Another says, "Resort to loans." "I will not do so (says Sir Robert), for we have had twenty-five years of peace, and if with such a period of peace, and a vast improvement in the condition of the wealthier classes, you cannot now meet the existing deficiency, how can it be met hereafter by our descendants, with a still continuing deficiency going on, and which must, from time to time, be likewise provided for?" A third says, "Repeal the last measures of the post-office—resort to increased postages, and seek for a revenue from that source of taxation." "No (says Sir Robert Peel), I will not say—*speaking with that caution for which I am sometimes taunted, but which, nevertheless, I find very useful*—I will *not* say that the post-office ought not to be a source of revenue; I will *not* say that it may not fairly become a means of taxation; but I say this, I do believe that the late measure has not yet had its full and fair trial, and that I am so sensible of the many advantages that result from it, that I do not think in the present year it is advisable that we should change it."

Oh, how many have been the predictions of the Whig and Whig-Radical press, that no sooner would the Tories accept office than they would at once destroy the people's enjoyments by raising the penny postage. Sir Robert Peel has given the lie to this libel, and has taken time to watch still further the operation of this cheap and popular system. We predicted in our last number that such would be the line of conduct he would pursue, and those predictions have been fully realized.

Others have suggested that the taxes which were formerly levied on articles of great consumption, such as salt, leather, and wool, should be revived. "No (says Sir Robert Peel), though the consumer did not profit, as he ought to have done, from the reduction of the *leather* tax, because a reduction of the duty on the importation of foreign hides was not adopted at the same time, yet I cannot consent to revive either that, or the salt or wool duties, since commercial arrangements, mercantile contracts, and new improvements in manufactures, have all been passed and carried with reference to those reductions."

Others have said, "Tax the railways." "No (says Sir Robert Peel), I will neither tax locomotion or gas—nothing but hard necessity would induce me to derive revenue from railroads." At the same time, this "cautious" man has, on the principle of strict justice, proposed a diminution in the taxation of stage coaches and of carriages let to hire. This is the sort of caution which John Bull will approve.

And how admirable was the satire of the Premier, directed against the inventors of new taxes—

"Who think that their inventive genius is on a level with that of Archimedes, when they discover a pianoforte, an umbrella, or some such article, not yet made the subject of taxation, and who immediately suggest the scheme to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, accompanied by a modest claim for a large per centage of the amount received, in consideration of the novelty of the thought, and the certain success of its operations."

Last, but not least, of all the miserable suggestions made to the Conservative Government for the increase of its revenue, and for providing for the existing deficiency, has been that of increasing the revenue of the country from diminished taxation. If the Government were in a position to wait—if the deficiency did not exist, and time could be allowed, that is, many years, for the experiment—such a plan might be brought to bear. But admirably did the Premier show, that in the case of the duty on wine, reduced from 5s. 9d. to 4s. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. the gallon, the revenue became yearly less, so that it never recovered in the case of wine. In that of tobacco, also, never has it yielded the amount of taxation it did prior to the reduction of the duty from four to three shillings per lb. Even in the case of coffee it took three years before a diminution of the duty led to an increase of revenue. Hemp was a complete failure, whilst rum has shown an increase.

In all the cases but those of coffee and rum, there has not been a recovery to the full amount of duty paid before the diminution within a period of five or six years. Therefore, to meet a large actual and every-day increasing deficiency, it would be

childish to propose to diminish the duty as a means of supplying immediate revenue.

Having rejected these varied schemes for supplying the existing deficiency, and providing against future need, it became the duty of Sir Robert Peel to lay before the house his plan of increased as well as improved taxation. And as the aristocracy, the gentry, the landed proprietors, and the middling classes had placed him in power, to them he appealed to maintain him in the post to which, by their votes at the late election, he had been raised by the confidence of the Queen. He appealed to the possessors of property for the purpose of repairing the evils which exist, and such an appeal as he has made cannot have been so made in vain. An income tax of sevenpence in the pound for a limited period is his grand remedy, and that remedy will not only supply the deficiency in the revenue, but will enable him, with confidence and satisfaction, to propose those great commercial reforms, which will have the effect of reviving commerce and improving the manufactures of the country. Let not the readers of *The Church of England Quarterly Review*, however, apprehend that the Premier is about to propose any wild, mad changes, such as those which Doctor Bowring or Colonel Thompson would approve. But they are those which, according to Sir Robert Peel, and we confide in his assurances—

“Will soon re-act on every other interest, and will ensure, even in a narrow, pecuniary point of view, by the diminished price of the articles of consumption and the cost of living, compensation to every one subject to the pecuniary charge, while it will more than reward him for the burden imposed, by relief from the contemplation of a mighty public evil.”

Notwithstanding the protests of the interested and the selfishness of the short-sighted, this measure of the income tax, limited to three years, when it will again be submitted to the consideration of Parliament, is the boldest as well as the wisest measure which any Government could have proposed; whilst its just and kind regard of all who have small incomes, and are unable to part with one penny per pound, or even per annum, will secure for that Government universal respect.

The great difficulty in this measure of the income tax was IRELAND. On the one hand, there does not exist in that country the necessary machinery for levying such a tax, as in Ireland there are no assessed taxes. Still something must be done. Ireland could not be exempted from increased taxation on any ground whatever, and therefore an additional duty on spirits, and an equalization of the stamp duties, must be resorted

to, in order to raise from that portion of the United Kingdom the proportion of increased taxes which must now be paid.

But as these increased and new taxes, when levied, would yield, added to the existing revenue, a larger amount than would be required to make up the deficiency and provide for the public service, as well as provide for the probably new demands on account of the Chinese and the Indian wars, it became necessary to state what was to be done with the large surplus. Sir Robert Peel calculates upon a surplus of 1,800,000*l.*, after defraying the excess of expenditure on account of the actual votes. And how does he propose to appropriate it? By some "cautious" and "timid" measure, such as the article in "*Fraser*" would indicate as the course which Sir Robert would be sure to adopt? Certainly not;—but by great changes and improvements in the COMMERCIAL TARIFF of the country, and by making a considerable abatement of the duties at present levied upon some of the *great articles of consumption*. Whilst this writer was penning *diatribes* against the Administration, Sir Robert and his coadjutors were examining, "in detail, each individual article of the tariff," though 1,200 in number, and were determining, in the case of each article, the proportion which the duty bore to its average price, for the purpose of determining to what extent it might be desirable to make a reduction of duty.

The principles on which Sir Robert Peel's Government has proceeded in this revision and improvements have been twofold: first, the removal of prohibition, in every case, and the reduction of duties amounting to prohibition; secondly, the reduction of duties on raw materials used in manufactures. The duty on articles partially manufactured are not to exceed twelve per cent., and the duty on manufactured articles not to exceed in any case twenty per cent. Out of 1,200 articles included in the tariff, the duties are to be reduced on 750, including all those which enter into manufactures. This is the best proof that "the Conservatives are at work," and supplies, at the same time, the most satisfactory answer to the critic in "*Fraser*," as well as to the prophecies of those, who, though not less mistaken than that writer, are not so well intentioned, or well disposed, towards the Government.

The resolution come to by Sir Robert Peel, not to reduce the duty on French brandies and wines until the French Chambers and Government shall prove, by their adoption of a commercial treaty with this country, that they are willing to act towards us on the real principle of reciprocity, is also especially worthy of praise; for, whilst that statesman has come to this decision, he

admits the importance of the commerce between the two countries being placed on a liberal and permanent basis. But he has evidently not forgotten that the French duties on English and Welsh coal and iron have not been diminished since the last reduction of English duties on French brandies and wines; and he properly feels, that, until this promised reciprocity shall be accorded, it is useless to hold out a hope to French brandy and wine consumers in this country that they will be able to obtain those delicious beverages at a cheaper rate. The French brandy and wine growers will of course hear with sorrow that no time can yet be fixed when the French Government will sign the commercial treaty with this country; but let them redouble their efforts, in and out of the French Chambers, to force the Government, or rather the Deputies, to a speedy termination of this long-pending negociation. It is much to be desired that the light and delightful wines of France, so free from unwholesome and deleterious substances and fluids, should be better known to our middling classes; but this can never be the case whilst the present duties are maintained, and they cannot be diminished until France shall consent to act with reciprocity.

Sir Robert Peel has also nobly declared, with reference to other articles of foreign produce, that, in the cases where foreign nations will not consent to reciprocal arrangements, he shall maintain the present amount of duty. At the same time, the removal of prohibitions, the relaxation of duties which approach by their severity and amount to prohibitions, and the reduction of duties on articles, such as oil and ores, whilst they will give a buoyancy to commerce, and confer great advantages on manufacturers, will not occasion a greater loss to the revenue than 270,000*l.* This is true economy, and this is another satisfactory proof that "*the Conservatives are at work.*"

"But why has not Sir Robert Peel reduced the duty both on foreign and colonial sugar?" asks some Fraserite of the fretful and impatient school, who thinks that whatever is *not* done, is of far more importance than that which is effected? Sir Robert Peel has supplied a satisfactory reply. *First*, he says, he will *not* consent to take Brazil or Cuba sugar whilst slavery exists there, and especially in so deplorable a manner as it does in Cuba. Hear this, ye Whig-Radical financiers! Whilst ye would propose to encourage the production of sugar by slave labour, by allowing its importation into this country at a reduced duty, a Conservative statesman says—

"No, we have purchased the freedom of our slaves at an immense sacrifice; and now we will not consent to put the sugar of slave states on such a footing as to compete with our own free colonies."

The Whig-Radical Ministers of last year paid no attention to this great moral and humane question. Their sugar project was wholly at variance with their professed love of liberty, and a desire to effect the total abolition of slavery; but no sooner do the Conservatives "set to work," than they proclaim it to be their firm determination not to abate for one instant in their demands for the total abolition of slavery. *Secondly*, Sir Robert Peel will not reduce the duty on colonial sugar, until he can also propose a reduction on foreign sugar; since, whilst the supply of sugar should remain a monopoly in the hands of the East and West India growers, the consumer at home would not derive any benefit from the reduction. This is another specimen of statesmanlike foresight and consideration. He does not seek to gain popularity by a reduction of duties which would only benefit the monopolists; but, first of all, he takes care that the moral principle of putting down slavery shall be secured, and *then* he looks to the interests of the consumer, and says he will consent to no alteration which shall not entail with it a necessary reduction to the public of the price of sugar. As he cannot secure these results for the present, he has adjourned the question. And, *thirdly*, he maintains he is backed in this view of the subject by the increase in the supply and consumption of sugar during the last two years; the market is well supplied, and the consumption is also greater. When the Conservatives "get to work," they have reasons to give for their conduct, which wise men will estimate and good men will approve.

The proposed reduction of the duty on coffee is a kind and considerate concession made to the working classes. The poor man finds in his basin of coffee at his early meal greater support, and a higher relish, than he does in tea. Coffee is a more exhilarating and exciting beverage, and it is more suitable for him than any other breakfast drink. In almost every cottage in the kingdom cheap coffee will be hailed as a glorious good. But then the reduction is to be made with wisdom. The absurdity of allowing foreign coffee to be sent to the Cape of Good Hope, and then be permitted to enter this country at the rate of duty paid on colonial coffee, is to be done away with, and British coffee is to pay a duty of fourpence per pound, and foreign eightpence. By this reduction, which will diffuse joy and gladness in so many thousands of cottages and garrets, cellars and humble dwellings, the Government will lose about 171,000*l.* per annum; but it relies on the aristocracy, the gentry, and the middling classes to make up all these deficiencies by the income tax.

The question of the **TIMBER DUTIES** has been so often before

the public, that we abstain from making any other remark, than that, now “the Conservatives are at work,” they propose to take off timber duties to the amount of 600,000*l.* per annum, and to afford that protection to the Canadas and to the Canadian timber trade which their importance demands, and which will secure the gratitude and increase the loyalty of the Canadian population. The concession made to Canada is wise and noble, and will not be lost upon the inhabitants of those colonies.

The remission of the EXPORT DUTIES on all BRITISH MANUFACTURED GOODS is an additional proof of the wisdom and nationality of the present Administration. Nothing can be more annoying to a merchant than to have to pay a duty on *exportation*. It is a serious drawback to his success in foreign markets; for he has first to pay a duty for exporting, and then, as soon as he crosses the Channel, an import duty to the foreign state where he discharges his freight. To beat competitors in foreign markets his profits must then be exceedingly low—or, as is often the case, the advantages offered are so small, that the trade in the articles on which an export duty has to be paid is virtually abandoned. By this concession to British manufacturers the Government will lose 100,000*l.* per annum; but the “cautious” Sir Robert Peel did not hesitate, however “timid” he may be, to propose the remission of these duties.

The relief to be afforded to stage coaches and to the letters-out of job carriages is considerate and kind. The great changes lately effected in the country by the establishment of railways have rendered the condition of the proprietors of stage coaches much less eligible; and the relief now to be afforded will be received with gratitude and joy.

Thus Sir Robert Peel, this “cautious” statesman, who has no great and comprehensive ideas, sufficiently large and grand to satisfy Mr. Roebuck or the writer in “*Fraser*,” has voluntarily come forward to propose a reduction of duties, which press upon manufactures, trade, and commerce, to the amount of 1,210,000*l.* per annum. This is a scheme worthy of great men and of a great nation, and shows most triumphantly that “the Conservatives are at work.”

We have concluded our task. In some respects, indeed, it has been painful; for we have had to rebuke and reprove those with whom we usually act in all matters of great principle, and from whom we differ with sorrow. But generally our task has been pleasing. Our investigations have led us yet more strongly to feel how essentially this country is Conservative, and how its interests are protected and promoted by Conservative principles, as well as how they are best understood by Conservative states-

men. And we have rejoiced, moreover, to feel that they *have* been understood in an especial manner at the present national crisis. There has been no timidity evinced; no desire to turn the question, or to avoid it; no postponing to a future time that which it was necessary to do at once, with a firm and a vigorous hand. We rejoice at the course which has been pursued, not only on account of the good which will be generally conferred by the adoption of these measures, but likewise on account of the honour and reputation which they will secure to the character of our Conservative rulers. Foreign powers have, of late, had their eyes more than usually fixed upon us. They have looked with curiosity, jealousy, or unkindness, upon our national condition, and they have wondered how we could possibly escape from so many threatening dangers. But if the propositions of Sir Robert Peel shall be carried, they will gaze upon Old Britain with more of wonder and admiration than they even ever yet felt; and, having already known how great she was in times of war, will acknowledge, with perhaps reluctant, but still truthful, testimony, that she is, if possible, yet greater in times of peace.

Ecclesiastical Report.

SINCE our last Report the Parliament of the United Kingdom has been assembled, and a speech has been delivered from the throne to the members of the two Houses. Parliamentary proceedings in general are not of such a character as to bring them under our cognizance in an Ecclesiastical Report; but a royal speech is at all times, and more especially in seasons like the present, an object of so much interest that some notice of it is necessary. We, therefore, offer a few remarks on

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

We need not quote the document itself, since all our readers are acquainted with its topics. All that we intend to do is to direct attention to some of the matters to which it alludes. There are some circumstances of a peculiar character connected with this royal speech.

Her Majesty alludes, in the first place, to the birth of the Prince of Wales, expressing her gratitude to Almighty God for his special favour. She also states that the King of Prussia had attended in person to act as sponsor, at her request. Now we regard the circumstance of the visit of the King of

Prussia with unusual satisfaction. The two countries are now linked together by a closer bond of union even than heretofore; and we are sure that, whatever may be the events which, in the providence of God, may take place in Europe, the people of this country will never forget the interesting relation in which his Prussian Majesty stands to the heir-apparent to the British throne. But we augur something more from the king's visit to this country. His Majesty has had an opportunity of attending the services of our Church: he listened to a sermon from the Bishop of London, and we are convinced that he has quitted England with a strong feeling in favour of the Anglican system. The King of Prussia is a Lutheran; but he could not have consented to undertake the office of sponsor to the royal infant had he not been disposed to view our Church with favour. To us, therefore, it appears highly probable that there is some foundation for the rumour that his Majesty is anxious to introduce episcopal government into his dominions. Connecting all the circumstances attendant on his visit to this country with the part he has taken in the establishment of a bishop of the Anglican Church at Jerusalem, we cannot avoid the conclusion that his Majesty has some object in view with respect to the ecclesiastical state of his own kingdom. One of the common topics with Papists, in arguing against Protestants, is our divisions. Not that the divisions among Protestants evidence the unsoundness of their creed; but we may observe, that the enemy would be deprived even of this semblance of an argument were the Protestant nations of Europe to agree in the same form of Church government. We by no means despair of witnessing such a result at no very distant day. Of course we do not expect that our English Dissenters will unite with the Church of England, but we do hope that the national Protestant Churches may be modelled after the same form. That form must be the episcopal: it was the government erected by the apostles; and no other was known in the Church during fifteen hundred years. Let episcopacy be introduced into the Protestant Churches, and their unity will be more complete than that to which the Church of Rome pretends. We say pretends, for the unity of which she boasts is only a pretence, having no existence except in name. Some persons, however, like Mr. Sibthorp and Mr. Spencer, are deceived by this pretence.

The slave trade is another topic on which we may offer a remark. Her Majesty intimates that a treaty has been concluded with the great European nations for its effectual suppression. For years other nations have carried it on, though England has used her utmost exertions to check such an awful

traffic. We, therefore, hail the announcement in the speech with peculiar satisfaction.

With respect to the Corn question, we would remark, that a most unchristian course has been pursued by many Dissenting ministers, who seem to have merged their religion in their politics, and to have acted the part of political demagogues rather than that of preachers of the Gospel of peace. It is painful to contemplate the proceedings of the Dissenting body. We allude not to the Manchester conference—of that we gave our opinion in a former Report; but we refer to the scenes which have taken place in Dissenting meeting-houses—to the sermons reported to have been delivered, and the prayers said to have been offered up, which have been more calculated to rouse the fiercer passions than to lead the soul towards heaven. What, in the name of common sense, do these Dissenting *reverends* know of the subject? How is it possible that they should be competent to give an opinion? And supposing that they were fully conversant with such matters—which, if they do their duty in their respective stations, is an impossibility—what right have they to step out of their sphere and assume the office of legislators? We know that many respectable Dissenters are disgusted with the conduct of their ministers. We believe, too, that the proceedings of the great body of the preachers are doing more injury to their cause than was ever inflicted by the arguments of their opponents. We leave them, however, to pursue their unholy vocation, feeling assured that their agitation will recoil on their own heads.*

One other topic in the speech demands a slight notice. We allude to the recommendation of a measure for the improvement of the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts in England and Wales. It was with much pleasure that we read this portion of the speech. The Ecclesiastical Courts need improvement. The expenses attendant on the prosecution of a suit are too great—the delays are too numerous—and, on many points, the jurisdiction is too limited. When the bill which the Government is about to introduce is submitted to Parliament, we shall take an opportunity of examining it in detail. In the mean time we are anxious to direct attention to the subject, feeling assured that it is one of the greatest importance.

To us her Majesty's speech is most satisfactory, and we are

* In a certain chapel in the West of England a petition against the Corn Laws was introduced immediately after a prayer meeting of the body, and handed from pew to pew for the signatures of those who were present, being of course the choicest members of the party. What an awful prostitution of the sacred name of religion!

convinced that it is satisfactory to the nation at large. The great question, namely, the Corn Laws, has been decided. Sir Robert Peel's scheme was affirmed by such a majority as has not been known on a great question for many years. The Whigs have blustered, and the Radicals have stormed; yet still their united efforts could not prevent the Premier from obtaining an overwhelming majority.

THE CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE SOCIETY.

In our last Report we were compelled, from want of space, to pass by this venerable society. We shall now select a few topics from the various monthly reports of their proceedings, which have been of a highly interesting character.

At the meeting in January, a letter was read from the Right Reverend W. Skinner, D.D., Bishop of Aberdeen and Primus, relative to the establishment of an episcopal college in Scotland. A synodal letter from the Scottish bishops was also read, and appears to have given great offence to some of the members of the committee. That English Churchmen should be alarmed at the establishment of an episcopal college in Scotland, when, as we are assured by Bishop Skinner, no apprehensions are entertained by the established Church of Scotland, strikes us as most extraordinary. The superscription of the letter proved a stumbling-block to some of the *weaker brethren*. It was as follows: "To all faithful members of the Reformed Catholic Church, the bishops in Scotland, greeting—grace be with you, mercy and peace, from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ." Surely this is a primitive superscription. It might have been supposed that the parties in question would have been satisfied; and we conceive that these very men who uttered their complaints would have been loud in their praises of such a document had it proceeded from the Presbyterian Church, and presbyters had been substituted for bishops. In such a case all would have been correct in the estimation of these gentlemen; but coming from a body of bishops, it was not to be tolerated. Nay, it would seem that these gentlemen suppose that bishops ought not to be allowed in Scotland, because Presbyterianism is established by law. Surely the Church of Scotland is able to protect its own interests, and needs not the aid of a few members of the committee of the society in London! We ask, then, why such sensitiveness on the part of English Churchmen respecting Presbyterianism? Do they view episcopacy and presbytery as standing on an equal footing, because one is recognized by the state in England, the other in Scotland? Or do they consider Church government in general as an indifferent thing? With laymen, who are not supposed to have paid much attention to these subjects,

such may be the case; but the strongest objectors, or, at all events, those who made the strongest remarks, were clergymen. They, therefore, could not consider episcopacy and presbytery as of equal authority, because they have solemnly declared, in the most solemn act of their lives, that they actually believe that there always have been three distinct orders of ministers in the Church—bishops, priests, and deacons. Nay, they have solemnly declared, by subscribing to the preface to the ordination service, that the thing is evident to all men reading holy Scripture and ancient authors. Now, if they view episcopacy and presbytery as of equal authority, they could not have been sincere at their ordination, and the sooner such men quit the pale of the Anglican Church the better. We repeat, that the grant to an episcopal college in Scotland could only be resisted on the grounds we have stated, and we assert, that, with those who subscribe to the Book of Common Prayer, it cannot be a matter of indifference whether episcopacy or presbytery prevails; or, if such be the case, the parties cannot subscribe to the book, nor hold office in the Anglican Church. We respect the Church of Scotland as established by law, but believing as we do that episcopacy is an ordinance of God, we cannot say that we should not prefer it in Scotland. We, as Churchmen, avow our belief in three orders of ministers—has the established Church of Scotland retained them? On the contrary, she avows her belief in one order only, for her deacons cannot be considered as ministers of the Church.

It follows, therefore, as a consequence from our principles, as avowed Churchmen, that, however we may value the services of the Scottish Church, we are bound to support the ordinances of God even in Scotland, and that, consequently, it is our duty to lend our aid to the episcopal Church in that country. These positions cannot be denied by Churchmen. Persons may differ from us in principle, but with such we have no concern in managing the present argument. We are alluding to English Churchmen—men who have declared their belief in three orders in the priesthood; therefore they cannot consistently refuse to support episcopacy in Scotland on the ground that presbytery is established. There is a Church in Scotland which retains the three orders and the apostolical government, and we are under an obligation to support that Church. Of course, our remarks apply to the clergy, not to the laity, since they are not called upon to subscribe to the Book of Common Prayer.

But from the unauthorized report of the proceedings of the committee, as published in the *Record*, we gather, that some of the members displayed no small share of actual ignorance in

speaking of the canons of 1604. It appears that Mr. Clarke stated that they were not canons of the Church, inasmuch as they had never received the sanction of Parliament. It is not competent for Parliament to enact a canon of the Church. It may, indeed, make a law, and impose it upon the Church, but canons of the Church can only be made by the Church herself. We are, however, at a loss to conceive how it is that Mr. Clarke and the editor of the *Record* are so anxious to entrust these matters to such an assembly as the House of Commons. We are also at a loss to know how Mr. Clarke, a lawyer, could have expressed himself in such a manner respecting the canons. The editor of the *Record* also stated, that their reporter understood one of the clerical members to say, that the canons of 1604 had never received the royal sanction. It is well known that the gentleman must have been a member of the committee, as strangers are not admitted; and, from what took place some years ago, the reporter is well known to the public. How then could this reporter, as a Churchman, and how could the editor of the *Record*, make a clergyman say, what he never could have said, that the canons had never been sanctioned by the king? Neither the editor nor the reporter could ever have read the canons, and if they have never paid attention to the subject they are not competent to form an opinion. In short, their total ignorance of the whole question was manifest from the report; and sure we are that such garbled accounts are calculated to do much mischief. In connexion with the same matter we may observe, that the editor of the *Record* some time before stated broadly in his paper, *that the canons of 1604 were not canons of the Church at all, but merely conventional rules among the clergy*. And this egregious error has not yet been contradicted! What, then, can be said of a paper, whose conductors take so high a ground in matters of religion? If errors are committed they should be corrected, but in this case the false statement was made, and has never been rectified. Is such a course, we will not say *Christian*, is it *honest*? Can the supporters of a paper who make such statements expect to be blessed in their course? We conceive that such things do more injury to the cause of religion than the attacks of avowed enemies.*

* We are not among those who join in a clamour against the *Record*. We admit that the paper, if conducted with temper and moderation, may do much good. Still we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that its editor, if a member of the Church of England at all, is not so, except from the circumstance of having his lot cast in England. When, too, it is remembered that some of the principal proprietors are *Presbyterians*, we cannot suppose that the conductors of that paper can be competent to sit in judgment in matters affecting the dis-

Further, in a note on the report to which we refer, the editor expresses a wish that his Scotch friends would tell him all about the canons in question. What could possibly be the meaning of such a note? Presbyterians, of course, know nothing of the matter—what, then, could be the aim of the editor in inserting such a passage? We therefore contend that the editor of the *Record* is bound, as a Christian and an honest man, to acknowledge the error into which he has fallen; and should he decline to do so, we feel convinced that, after this public notice of his conduct, many persons who have supported that paper will withdraw their support altogether. We have not censured him unnecessarily; we have not brought forward a vague charge; we have pointed out a most erroneous statement, and we call upon him, on Christian grounds, to acknowledge the error. The *Record* is very severe on others, therefore we have a right to expect that no statement should appear in such a paper unless it be *true*, or, at all events, that any erroneous statement should be corrected.

Before we quit the subject, we would allude to another specimen, not unfrequently witnessed, of ignorance in members of the Anglican Church in speaking of the state of things in Scotland. Members of the Church of England, say they, are Dissenters in Scotland. Dissenters from what, we ask? From Presbyterianism they dissent, undoubtedly; but we view the term as indicative of those who dissent, not from a system established by law, but from the discipline and government established by Christ and his apostles. These gentlemen, to whom we allude, consider every man a *Dissenter* who is opposed to any established system. In this sense we glory in the name, and all Churchmen are Dissenters. But, according to our view, the Dissenter is one who departs from the government established by Christ. Thus all who separate from the Anglican Church are Dissenters, because the Anglican Church retains the apostolic order. Presbyterians, therefore, in Scotland, as departing from the primitive practice, are Dissenters, even though their system is established by law. We repudiate the

cipline and government of the Anglican Church. It may be said, that the editor is a Churchman, because he attends our worship; but we ask whether he is not a Presbyterian by education, and therefore incompetent to the task of conducting a paper on Church of England principles? We should not have made these observations had he proceeded with discretion, and abstained from remarks about our canons—a subject which he does not understand. Many of the articles in the *Record* are evidently written by men who deem it right to support an Established Church, as such, whether episcopal or presbyterian. Such men are not to dictate to the Anglican clergy; they cannot subscribe to our ordination service.

dangerous notion, that an Act of Parliament can make or destroy a Church, or make a man a Dissenter in one place while he is not so in another. It will follow from these principles, that the members of the episcopal Church in Scotland are members of the Church Catholic, and, consequently, that they are not Dissenters, except from Presbyterianism, from which, if they receive the apostolic order, they must, of necessity, dissent. We should not have noticed the subject but for the ignorance displayed by some Churchmen.

It gives us much pleasure to state, that the cavils of a few ignorant Churchmen in the committee did not avail to stop the grant of money towards the proposed college. We have charged the members of the committee, who opposed the grant on the ground that there was a Presbyterian Church in Scotland, with *ignorance*, and we deliberately make the charge. We have proved that they must have been ignorant of the principles which they have solemnly subscribed. At all events, if they are not chargeable with *ignorance*, they are guilty of something worse. We leave them in this dilemma, to extricate themselves as they may be able.

The society, we are happy to observe, is flourishing. Numerous grants are made to various institutions connected with the spread of Christian knowledge at home and abroad; bibles, and prayer-books, and tracts, are circulated in every direction, and the happiest results may be anticipated.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS.

This venerable Missionary Society is still prosecuting its arduous course in making known the way of life to the inhabitants of our distant colonies. Their missionaries are becoming more numerous; various grants have been made for churches and other objects, and the most gratifying accounts are, from time to time, received from almost every portion of the habitable world. There is, however, a sad want of clergymen to go out as missionaries.

In connexion with this subject we feel constrained to notice another society, having the same objects in view, namely, the Colonial Church Society. It is a society for sending out *clergymen, catechists, and schoolmasters to the colonies*. Is not this the precise object of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel? Why then should another society of the same character be established, when additional funds are so greatly needed by the old society? Can any objection be raised against the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel? Is it not most

laboriously engaged in the sacred work? And being under the control of the proper ecclesiastical authorities, have we not the best guarantee that it will be properly conducted, and that the funds contributed will be properly expended? If so, surely a new society was not called for; and surely, in these times, Churchmen should be united, not divided. The Colonial Church Society does not, in our opinion, present such strong claims to support. Its field of operation is identical with that of the venerable society; and as every society requires an expensive machinery to conduct its business, we contend, even allowing that the committee are conscientious in the discharge of their trust, that a great saving would be effected by contributing the same sums to the society which has been so long established. But we have another objection. Who are the committee? Certain clergymen and laymen, who are irresponsible, except to a meeting of subscribers, for any of their proceedings. We do not insinuate that money will be misapplied; but knowing as we do the loose Churchmanship of some laymen, yea, and of some clergymen too, we cannot but look with suspicion on a society formed under such circumstances. We would, therefore, earnestly recommend our readers to give their undivided support to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and not to create disunion in the Church by lending their aid to new societies, when the work can be so much better accomplished by those already in existence.

Let it be remembered that the *venerable society* would be able to extend its sphere of labour, if it were favoured with additional support. We trust, therefore, that Churchmen will consider themselves under a solemn obligation to promote its interests.

COLONIAL BISHOPRICS.

It is gratifying to find that the plan for sending out bishops to our colonies has been so generally approved. Already have two bishops been appointed—the Bishop of Jerusalem and the Bishop of New Zealand. The Bishop of Jerusalem has actually made his entry into the ancient city, and under circumstances, too, which warrant the conclusion that the Turkish government, whatever may have been affirmed to the contrary, is not actuated by feelings of jealousy towards the appointment of an English prelate. We are sure that the account of his progress from the ancient Ramah to the holy city will be perused with the greatest interest.

Our readers will remember a declaration issued from Lambeth in 1841, stating the objects in contemplation. That declara-

tion has since been subscribed by all the archbishops and bishops of the United Church. A standing committee of bishops was appointed, whose duty it will be to confer with the ministers of the crown, and to arrange measures in concert with them, for the erection of bishoprics in the places mentioned in the declaration.

Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies has also announced his intention of bringing a bill into Parliament for the subdivision of the diocese of Barbadoes into three distinct bishoprics, of which British Guiana will be one. There will, therefore, be three bishops where hitherto one only has been fixed. In due time, as the State becomes impressed with the duty of providing for the spiritual wants of all its subjects, other sees will again be formed out of those into which the former diocese of Barbadoes is now divided.

The next appointment, however, will be a bishop to preside over the clergy and congregations scattered along the shores of the Mediterranean. The bishop will reside during a portion of the year at Malta; but he will bear the title of Bishop of Gibraltar. This arrangement must strike every one as most judicious, Gibraltar being one of the possessions of Great Britain, and the Anglican Church being the established religion of the fortress. The diocese will be of great extent, for the bishop will have the superintendence of all the congregations of our countrymen in the various cities along the coast from Lisbon to Constantinople.

Bishops are also to be placed, as soon as circumstances will permit, in New Brunswick, the Cape of Good Hope, Van Dieman's Land, and Ceylon. But we trust that the Government at home will take up the subject, and not cease until all our colonies are placed under episcopal control. We shall not be satisfied until the State considers it to be its duty to send out bishops wherever it fixes its military governors or its civil authorities. Surely it is incumbent on a Christian Government to provide as well for the spiritual as for the temporal wants of its subjects.

Of course large funds are necessary, in order that the objects may be carried even partially into effect; and while the Government does not feel at liberty to grant the necessary resources, they must be supplied by private benevolence. We rejoice, therefore, in the proposal of the Bishop of London, whose example will, we trust, be followed by the prelates in their respective dioceses. His lordship remarks, in the letter addressed to the clergy of his diocese—

“I am persuaded that the accomplishment of the object which we

have in view may be ensured, under the blessing of God, if the clergy will exert themselves to collect contributions in their respective parishes ; and I am desirous of suggesting to those of my own diocese the propriety of commencing that exertion on the first day of the approaching holy week, in which we commemorate the death and passion of our blessed Lord, and offer up our special prayers for all estates of men in his holy Church, and for the gathering together in one fold, under one Shepherd, of all those who are not yet within its enclosure."

We are sure that every clergyman will concur with his lordship in the necessity of commencing the most active exertions, and many will probably adopt the plan recommended in the letter. His lordship proceeds to recommend that a collection should be made in aid of the funds for the endowment of bishoprics in the colonies. The manner, too, is suggested :—

"I would suggest (says the bishop) that it might be made in the following manner :—After the sermon, in which I trust you will explain the object for which the offerings of your people are solicited, let the offertory sentences be read from the communion table, not omitting those which instruct them that are taught in the word to minister unto them that teach in all good things. Whilst these sentences are reading, let the churchwardens, or other persons appointed for that purpose, collect the offerings of the people, and bring them to the minister, to be by him humbly presented and placed upon the holy table. This revival of the ancient practice of our Church has been attempted in several parishes with great success ; but although I would gladly see it become general, I do not wish to interfere with your discretion, in the present instance, if you should have good reason for preferring some other mode of making the collection."

We conceive that no one could possibly object to such a proposal from such a quarter. We are not acquainted with the success of the plan recommended by his lordship ; but we believe that it was very considerable. Let a similar method be generally pursued, and the deficiencies of the State will be made up from private contributions.

ADDRESSES TO THE ARCHBISHOP AND BISHOPS ON THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

This is a new practice, and greatly to be deprecated. Opposed as we are to the Tracts, we conceive that this is not the method of opposing them : nor is it just towards the archbishop. What, indeed, can his grace do in the matter ? It must be painful to him to return answers to some of the lay addresses, for instance, which are characterized by little except ignorance of the subject to which they call his grace's attention. If the writers of the Tracts are guilty of publishing false doctrines, the bishops of the dioceses in which they reside are bound to proceed against them ; but as a body, the bishops can do nothing.

Respecting some of the laymen by whom the addresses are signed, we would remark that their Churchmanship is only in name. They may attend the worship of the Church; but they would not object to the worship of the meeting-house.

But the plan is not only useless, it is unwise. We will suppose that the archbishop and bishops had the power to put forth an authoritative declaration on any point of doctrine or practice. Let us suppose, further, that at any given period they were all agreed on a particular point—let it be the question of *baptismal regeneration*. Supposing, too, that a large mass of the respectable classes should petition the archbishop and bishops, calling on them to declare that it was the doctrine of the Anglican Church that *regeneration*, in the strict and proper sense, always took place in baptism. We offer no opinion of our own on the question; but we ask the addressers, clerical and lay, what would be their position were such the case? By this new practice of theirs they are actually setting an example to others to do the same thing, though for different ends. This illustration may, perhaps, convince the parties of their indiscretion in addressing the archbishop and bishops.

The bishops generally have done what they were bound to do, namely, protest against certain views propounded in the Tracts; but they cannot issue any declaration which would be binding on the Church. Such a result, indeed, as the petitioners expect, could only be produced by a decree of convocation. Under present circumstances, therefore, we deem it most unwise to address the archbishop and bishops on the subject. Such a course can lead to no good result, while, at the same time, it may place the archbishop and his brethren in a most painful position. We say a painful position, because, if no answer were returned, it would be considered uncourteous; and a mere acknowledgment of the receipt of the address would be deemed a proof of indifference; so that it must be extremely difficult for the archbishop and bishops to act in such matters.

It appears that an address was presented to the Bishop of London from the Protestant operatives and tradesmen of Marylebone. The language would induce us to believe that the address was prepared by others, who subsequently procured the subscriptions of the operatives. They talk, for instance, of “seeking to illumine the darkness of the spiritual atmosphere by the dim and flickering light of tradition, and the too often obscure and conflicting opinions of ‘the Fathers.’” Is it probable that the operatives of Marylebone are capable of deciding whether the opinions of the fathers are or are not conflicting? Why should such language be adopted by parties who cannot

be supposed to understand the subject? It is only injuring the cause which all sound Churchmen wish to promote. These same operatives tell his lordship that they could mention places in which ceremonies, not enjoined by the rubric, are practised: and they further add, that they have heard doctrines preached which were opposed to the Thirty-nine Articles. The charge may be true; but we question whether all the persons who signed the address were competent to decide so grave a question. We question, indeed, whether all the parties are acquainted with the Thirty-nine Articles. If doctrines have been preached in opposition to the Articles, the Bishop of London can proceed against the offenders; but he must have better evidence than that of some Protestant operatives, who are not likely to be profoundly acquainted with such matters—nor quite competent to decide in cases of heresy. The bishop's reply was admirable. He stated that he could not proceed on general allegations: "but (says his lordship), if any particular instance of departure from the rubric, or any opposition to the articles of our Church, is brought under my notice, it will be my duty to enquire into the circumstances of the case." The parties should have specified the instances to which they referred; and they are still bound to do so, in order that the necessary enquiries may be instituted. But supposing it turns out, that the ceremonies to which they allude, though perhaps not wisely introduced, are enjoined in the rubric; or, supposing that the doctrines complained of should not be in opposition to the Articles, what then would be the position of the Bishop of London? He would commence an enquiry which would be painful to all parties. Of course, such charges should not be made without positive evidence on the subject; and we must again remark, that operatives are not the persons to decide on such grave questions, as what is or is not in accordance with the rubrics, and what is opposed to, or in agreement with, the Articles.

We notice these things with pain. Every number of ours will prove that we are opposed to many of the views of the Tracts, indeed to all their unsound or questionable views; but we regret that such an injudicious course should be pursued by members of our Church, feeling assured that a mis-managed opposition, instead of checking the evil, is calculated rather to increase it. We cannot think that our operatives are called upon to pronounce an opinion on such subjects; or, at all events, if they address the bishops, they should abstain from inflated language, and from allusions to matters which every well-informed individual must know are foreign to their habits and pursuits.

The Record has stated, in a most unseemly manner, that the

Metropolitan is mute, and that he is so in consequence of certain men, who, according to the *dictum* of this journalist, have established themselves at Lambeth. It might be supposed from such language that they had taken forcible possession of the palace. The editor of the *Record* states broadly, that under their influence the archbishop is mute. The Bishop of London is also censured for licensing a particular clergyman in his diocese. These remarks of that journalist's afford convincing proof of what we have already stated, that a man trained up in a Presbyterian Church, even though in England he may conform to the Church of England, and holding, as we believe is the case with the gentleman in question, that episcopacy is to be supported or opposed according as a man is resident on one side of the Tweed or the other, is not competent to offer an opinion on such subjects. We would suggest to this gentleman, that there are cases where a bishop cannot refuse a licence, except on the ground of false doctrines—a question of which not the bishop, but an ecclesiastical court, is to be the judge. There are other cases, too, in which a bishop would be considered as acting a most tyrannical part were he to refuse. We know nothing of the circumstances connected with the particular case, but we do know that a bishop's position is a very difficult one, and such as cannot be understood by the editor of the *Record*. The Archbishop and the Bishop of London will, we have no doubt, consult the best interests of the Church; and it is not seemly in the editor of any paper—certainly not in the editor of the *Record*, for reasons already stated—to prescribe a line of conduct for our ecclesiastical authorities. We will simply ask that gentleman whether it might not be injurious to the cause of truth to put forth declarations which might be regarded or not at the discretion of the clergy, but which the bishops would have no authority to enforce. This idea has evidently never occurred to the editor of the *Record*, or he would not speak as he has done of our bishops.

While, however, we censure such injudicious opponents of the Tracts for the Times, we are anxious to state that we are by no means insensible to the evil tendency of their publications; and while we condemn the system of addressing the archbishops and bishops, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that the writers of the Tracts are causing divisions in the Church. No individual has a right to adopt any ceremony unless it is enjoined by our own Church. It is not sufficient that it is recommended by the practice of the primitive Church, though we deny that the usages in question have such recommendation. It is sufficient to reply to all such arguments, our Church has retained what

was deemed necessary, and we cannot go beyond what she has prescribed. We remind the writers of the Tracts, that they who go beyond the prescribed rule are as much dissenters from the Anglican Church as those who do not come up to it. We remind them further, that they are the offenders in this controversy, by introducing practices not sanctioned by the Church; and we appeal to their good sense, whether they are justified in disturbing the peace of the Church for matters of such trivial importance. On the score of prudence it might be supposed that they would desist from their course. They cannot alter the doctrines and practices of the Church of England; and we call upon them, therefore, to desist from agitating such questions as are introduced in many of the Tracts, since the issue must be injurious to the best interests of our Catholic Church.

THE BAPTISM OF THE PRINCE OF WALES.

We have alluded, in noticing the Queen's speech, to this interesting event, but only in connexion with the King of Prussia's acting as sponsor. The circumstance is too important to be passed over cursorily. It is a great national event, to which the people will look back with feelings of the highest gratification. The ordinance was administered in St. George's Chapel, and not in the chapel of the Palace. Many prayers, we doubt not, were offered up, on the day of the baptism, for the infant prince and for his royal parents. Nor will the people forget that his Prussian Majesty came over to this country for the express purpose of being present on the occasion. The infant prince was admitted by baptism into Christ's holy Catholic Church; and we trust that, should he be spared to reign over this great nation, he will prove a strenuous assertor of the rights and privileges of that Church of which he will be the sworn defender and protector. As far as our observation has gone no unseemly remarks were indulged in on the occasion by any of the Dissenting press. Such a course would indeed have recoiled upon themselves had it been pursued; but we are convinced that every respectable Dissenter must have been fully impressed with a sense of the solemnity and importance of the event. Since the baptism, an order in council, authorizing the addition of the name of the prince to the words previously appointed, has been agreed upon, and we now pray for ALBERT PRINCE OF WALES.

ADDRESSES TO THE KING OF PRUSSIA.

It must have been gratifying to his Prussian Majesty to witness the enthusiasm with which his visit to this country was hailed by the people in general. Various addresses, some from

public bodies, others from the clergy, and others from societies, were presented to his Majesty during his brief sojourn amongst us. The topics introduced into these addresses were generally the same, viz., his acting as sponsor to the Prince of Wales, and the establishment of the bishopric at Jerusalem. From the answers of his Majesty, it is clear that he values our Anglican Church; and, with such views, it is evident that he would readily, if it should be practicable, introduce our government into the Church of his own land. We are of opinion that a union in Church government might be effected between our Church, as a branch of the Church Catholic, and the Protestant Churches on the continent. In every case, at the period of the reformation, the Churches abroad would have retained episcopal government if they had been able. It happened that the bishops did not, as in England, concur in the reformation, so that the apostolic form could not be retained; but all the leaders of the reformation admitted that episcopacy was the apostolical method, and that they could gladly submit to it. In a case of necessity, like that in which the foreign reformers were placed, we readily admit that a strong plea may be urged. But should the foreign Churches now deem it right to return to the primitive practice, there would be no difficulty. Some few of the clergy in each country might receive consecration in England, and on their return they could consecrate to the episcopal, and ordain to the priestly office. May such a union be effected between the Protestant Churches of Europe!

THE CAMBRIDGE CAMDEN SOCIETY.

Several Societies, with similar objects in view, have been established within the last few years, but none of them seem to proceed with so much zeal and activity as the Cambridge Camden Society. The Oxford Architectural Society is, however, pursuing a similar course, and both are actively employed in disseminating a knowledge of ecclesiastical architecture, in procuring the restoration of our ancient churches, and in improving the taste of the age in the erection of new ones. The publications of the Cambridge Camden Society are exceedingly interesting, and calculated to be very useful. Some persons have dignified the objects contemplated by this society as *trumpery*, but when we consider the quarters from which such censures proceed, we need neither be surprised nor distressed. To preserve the memorials of our ancestors is not a *trumpery* employment; and notwithstanding the ignorant declamations of parties, who have neither the taste nor the inclination for such pursuits, we say to the Cambridge Society, *go*

on and prosper! It seems that the preservation of ancient brasses has given great offence to some squeamish personages, yet the language employed by the society respecting them appears to be quite inoffensive. The objectors would have been admirable troopers in Cromwell's army. During the Commonwealth many monumental brasses were torn up and sold. Probably the persons who condemn the Camden Society consider the sacrilegious conduct of that period as a laudable service. At all events, it is clear that these same individuals would tear up and destroy all the remaining brasses in our churches, lest, as in the case of the brazen serpent of old, the people should fall down and worship them. Now we desire our readers to bear in mind, that little more than a century ago the predecessors of these objectors designated *prelacy* as *popery*; and even now, in Scotland, there are not a few persons who coincide with the language of *The solemn League and Covenant*, which is still retained in the Scottish confession of faith, and in which the offensive expressions are still to be found. As some of our readers may not have *The solemn League and Covenant* at hand, we quote the following passage:—

“That we shall, in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavour the extirpation of popery, *prelacy* (that is, church government, by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy), superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found to be contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness.”

The precious document from which this choice passage is extracted is still retained among the authorized formularies of the Established Church of Scotland. We are aware that, though retained, it is disregarded by the more respectable of the ministers; but at the same time, there are not a few in that country who cordially concur in *The solemn League and Covenant*, to the very letter. And from whom do those murmurs, and declamations, and outcries, a specimen of which we have given in the case of the Camden Society, proceed, but from those *Presbyterians* who are imported from the north into London, where they hold the pen of the critic, and presume to sit in judgment on the members of the Anglican Church, dictating to the readers of their lucubrations what they are to receive and what they are to reject. Since, therefore, there are men who can still subscribe to the *Covenant*, and since some of these individuals find their way to this metropolis, where they constitute themselves as arbiters of the public taste and guides of the public opinion, we cannot be surprised at such outbreaks

as those to which we have referred, in the case of the Camden Society.

Having defended the society from the low abuse of some of their opponents, we must allege a complaint against them, founded on the December number of the *Ecclesiologist*. In that number is inserted a letter respecting the use of the term *altar* in some of the society's publications. An answer is also subjoined, of which we have a complaint to make. We would, however, remark, that we consider the use or disuse of the term to be a matter of indifference. We know that persons may speak of the *altar* without ever dreaming of the Romish sacrifice of the mass. But we disapprove of the course adopted in the reply. For example, the society defend the use of the term from the practice of Bishop Montague. This prelate held several obnoxious views; and on certain points connected with the Church of Rome, he was at issue with Archbishop Laud, whose opinions on all fundamental doctrines were perfectly sound; consequently we are sorry to see such an authority adduced. But this is not our chief cause of complaint. We select the following passage as containing matter directly at variance with the facts; and we cannot but express our surprise that the Camden Society, who are generally so well-informed on such subjects, should have fallen into the error:—

“Because the rubrick (authorized by the first rubric of our Prayer Book) which orders two lights ‘for the signification that Christ is the very true light of the world,’ orders them to be placed ‘on the high altar.’”

This is a most singular statement, and altogether incorrect. In the first place, we observe, that if any such rubric existed, it could not be put in practice, because we have no *high altar* in any of our churches. But, secondly—and this is the grave objection to the statement—no such rubric ever existed. Nothing of the kind is to be found in the *Communion Book*, published in A.D. 1547, in the *first liturgy* of Edward VI., A.D. 1549, or in the *second*, A.D. 1552. In short, there never was such a rubric. What, then, it may be alleged, do the society mean by using such language? We shall furnish an answer to this question. In the injunctions of King Edward, all lights are ordered to be removed from churches except two, which are permitted to remain on the high altar. At the time when the injunctions were issued, altars were not removed from our churches, but they were taken away very soon afterwards, and with the *altar* the *lights* disappeared also. The injunctions were revived in a modified form by Queen Elizabeth, but there is no mention of the

altar or the *lights*—consequently, the clauses in question have no authority, since the *lights* could not be used without the *altars*. Now the error of the society consists in this, that they have quoted an unauthorized portion of an injunction as an authorized rubric. In fact, the writer, and the committee who sanctioned the passage, were unacquainted with the facts of the case. They had some recollection of the passage in the injunctions, and, without pausing to ascertain the correctness of their impression, they put forth the answer which we have quoted. We point out this mistake in a most friendly spirit, and we entertain the hope that the committee will not injure a good cause by unguarded statements in future.

CONVERTS TO ROMANISM.

Mr. Sibthorp's example, it appears, has been followed by some few secessions from the Anglican Church to that of Rome. We are not surprised at this, for we are well aware, that, when men entertain such views as those by which Mr. Sibthorp appears to have been influenced, they must take refuge in Romanism. Mr. Sibthorp, however, is the chief of the seceders, and he has published a reply to an imaginary question—“*Why are you become a Catholic?*” We call this an imaginary question, because we are convinced that such a question was never proposed by any member of the Anglican Church. We take it for granted that Mr. Sibthorp has altered the form of the question, which was either “*Why are you become a Roman Catholic?*” or, “*Why have you joined the Church of Rome?*” We challenge Mr. Sibthorp to reply to our remarks, for we are quite sure that the precise question was not proposed. In our opinion, the title-page of the reverend gentleman's pamphlet presents as pretty a piece of Jesuitism as we ever recollect to have seen. It is not our intention to expose the sophistry of the pamphlet, but we could not permit the title-page to remain unnoticed. We will only add, that the Church of England can easily spare such a man as Mr. Sibthorp.

The letters of Dr. Biber, of which a short notice will be found among our smaller reviews, are particularly valuable, as they exactly point out the position which Mr. Sibthorp must occupy in the mind of every right-judging man.

General Literature.

Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Michael Thomas Sadler, Esq., M.P., F.R.S. London: Seeleys. 1842.

THE life of Mr. Sadler, though very barren of what are generally called "events," was yet one of great usefulness and importance. He was, in the best sense of the word, a Christian philosopher, and his philosophy was all the more *practical* from its Christianity. The volume before us is one which will be an acceptable contribution to the "political economy" of the country. The falsehood and the inhumanity of Malthusianism are strikingly displayed in an able analysis of Mr. Sadler's system:—

" 'A man born into a world *already possessed*,' * says Mr. Malthus, 'if he cannot get subsistence from his parents' (who may not be living,) 'and if society does not want his labour, *has no claim of right to the smallest portion of food*, and, in fact, *has no business to be where he is*. At Nature's mighty feast, there is no vacant cover for him. She tells him to be gone, and will quickly execute her own orders, if he do not work upon the compassion of some of her guests. If these guests get up and make room for him, *other intruders* immediately appear, demanding the same favour.'

"The remedy which Mr. M. very consistently proposes against these 'intruders' is a very simple one.

" 'I propose a regulation to be made, that no child born from any marriage taking place after the expiration of a year from the date of the law, and no illegitimate child born two years from the same date, *should ever be entitled to parish assistance*.

" 'This would operate as a fair, distinct, and precise notice.'

"After this public notice had been given, the poor man marrying is to be dealt with as one guilty of 'an immoral act.'

" 'To the punishment of nature, he should be left, *the punishment of severe want*.' 'All parish assistance should be *most rigidly* denied to him; and if the hand of private charity be stretched forth in his relief, the interests of humanity imperiously require that it should be administered very *sparingly*. He should be taught to know that the laws of nature, *which are the laws of God*, had *doomed him and his family to starve* for disobeying their repeated admonitions.'"

If this be not blasphemy, then we confess we know not what is. It appears to us a deliberate giving the lie at once to creation and its Creator. It is contradictory to philosophy, and equally so to experience and history. Mr. Sadler, however,

* "He does not hesitate to *assume*, that the world is '*already possessed*,' although not one-tenth of its surface is yet brought under cultivation. Even in this 'over-peopled' country, Britain, the territory still left uncultivated and unpossessed exceeds thirty millions of acres, more than the half of which is capable of repaying the cultivator."

overthrew a theory which had, from its very first appearance, been hailed with delight by all the clique of infidel legislators and infidel philosophers, if, indeed, we do not profane the name of philosophy by applying it to such persons, we would willingly here enter into the *rationale* of that system which Mr. Sadler substituted for the Malthusian, but our limits forbid; though we may possibly return at some future time to the subject. We have stated that Mr. Sadler overthrew the theory of Malthus, and substituted another. A remarkable proof that these words are not too strong, may be found in the following passage:—

“A brief mention may here be made of a single circumstance, which may perhaps, to many minds, place the fact of the destruction of the Malthusian theory in a clearer point of view. We allude to the remarkable change in the marketable value of Mr. Malthus’s work.

“When Mr. Sadler first explained his theory, and produced his proofs, to the publisher of Mr. Malthus’s work, the exclamation of the latter was—‘Why, Sir, you are going to destroy a copyright which cost me five hundred guineas!’ And most fully and literally was this prediction fulfilled.

“At the moment of the appearance of Mr. Sadler’s treatise, in the commencement of 1830, the writer of these lines felt it desirable to compare the two systems together; and not having a very high opinion of Mr. Malthus’s work, he sought for a copy at a cheaper rate than the usual price. But the reply was, that it was never to be had even a shade below the publication price; and that second-hand copies, in sales, brought nearly the first cost when new.

“Such was the market-value of the book in the year 1830. In the year 1835—only five years afterwards—the publisher sold off the remainder of the edition, issued at 24s., and the price he obtained for them was 5s. 9d. per copy!

“Whether there exists a parallel case, of a work, previously considered to be of established fame, and yet thus utterly and almost instantly destroyed by an opposing theory, we are unable to say.”

Mr. Sadler devoted himself to the moral, physical, and religious improvement of his poorer brethren; and as he well knew the condition of the poor in the manufacturing districts, he applied himself, by every means in his power, to the alleviation of their great and evident distress. Nor did he satisfy himself with a mere theoretical device for their benefit. He spent his life in their cause; and though he might in some particulars be ill advised or ill informed, we may yet boldly and conscientiously declare, that the poor of this land never had a truer friend than Michael Thomas Sadler. We do not agree with him, when he asserts that we have not a redundant population; and we are, moreover, convinced that emigration, or rather colonization, is not merely expedient, but essential to our future national well-

being. As a public speaker, Mr. Sadler was decidedly a failure, and the following remarks very gently convey to the reader the fact :—

“ The possession of great talents, extensive knowledge, and the soundest principles, does not always complete the character of one who is competent to lead and to influence the minds of others. Many, it is true, we have, who exhibit much skill in displaying to the best advantage their slender stock of knowledge ; but we have also a few who know far more than they can, with any degree of success, impart to others. Mr. Sadler, assuredly, belonged to the latter class. Not that he failed to attract considerable attention as a speaker, during his short Parliamentary career ; but that the rank he took in the House of Commons, and its acceptability among its members, seldom bore any proportion to his just pretensions. He was, in fact, weighed down and hampered with the abundance of his intellectual stores. A wise man once said, that ‘ if he had his hand full of truths, he would open but one finger at a time.’ And this maxim ought to be especially borne in mind by any one desirous of entering on a useful Parliamentary career. That assembly, pressed with a constant load of business, and necessarily always full of haste and impatience, will seldom listen to *dissertations*, except from a very few favourites of established reputation. The beginner must confine himself to the rapid sketch, the terse observation, the happy application, the point well made out, and the whole glanced over with a rail-road rapidity. But this was not Mr. Sadler’s style. Full of matter on almost every subject of real interest, he felt a constant difficulty in compressing his arguments, so as to render them sufficiently superficial and popular for that assembly. And thus it was that while the eight or ten speeches of length, delivered by him during the four years of his Parliamentary career, defy all comparison with any others of the same period, for extent of knowledge, depth of argument, and justness of view, yet the speaker himself cannot be said, in the common acceptation of the term, to have been eminently successful as a Parliamentary orator. The rising of Mr. Burke in that House is reported to have been usually the signal for a general adjournment to dinner ; and although nothing equally strong can with truth be averred of Mr. Sadler—who always had an auditory, and often an attentive one—yet it is certain that every one of his efforts in Parliament was far more justly appreciated by the country at large, than by those who had the advantage of listening to it.”

Yet he was by no means destitute of eloquence. On the contrary, we could produce from his Parliamentary speeches, passages that were never surpassed, even by Burke himself. The conclusion of his speech on the Reform bill is a specimen which will amply bear out our opinion. Quoting the words of Sir James Mackintosh, he proceeds :—

“ ‘ The powers of the King and Lords (says Sir J. Mackintosh) have never been formidable in England, but from discords between the

House of Commons and its pretended constituents. Were the House really to become the vehicle of the popular voice, the privileges of the other bodies, in opposition to the sense of the people and their representatives, would become *as dust in the balance*. If, then, in this new system, not only the Lords temporal, and all their power and privileges, and the hierarchy of the Church, representing as they do their own order, but the Sovereign himself, would become 'as dust in the balance' when weighed against this reformed House of Commons, can we suppose that such unwieldy and expensive parts of the system would be retained, their functions having become totally superseded and their very existence useless? That the Monarchy itself, expensive as it must necessarily be, would in these days of rigid frugality and retrenchment be retained, its power being as dust in the balance, and its office therefore useless, it were folly and infatuation to suppose. No, Sir, with a House of Commons thus 'reformed,' on the authority of the hon. member of his Majesty's Government I have just quoted, the fate of the peerage and of the monarchy is sealed. The next sweeping reform, and it could not be far distant, would wipe away this expensive 'dust,' and give to the government of the country not the essence merely, that it would have the moment this bill should pass,—but the very name of democracy. Let then his Majesty's present advisers, supposing (which God forbid) this measure should pass, approach their Sovereign with this bill; and, practising on his generous and unsuspecting nature, obtain his assent—at the moment his royal hand shall inscribe the fatal act, it will require no peculiar strength of mental vision to perceive the image of another hand, shadowy indeed, but darkening into reality, and inscribing in portentous characters upon the tablets of the history of this ancient monarchy, *MENE*—'Thy kingdom is departed from thee!'"

If it be said that this tremendous warning has not been justified by the event, we would say to the objector, "The end is not yet;" and what may be the result we know not! Meantime, those who feel an interest in the life of a good and able man will read with profit as well as pleasure that of Michael Thomas Sadler.

Memoir of the Life of Richard Phillips. London: Seeley and Burnside. 1842.

MR. PHILLIPS was a worthy member of the Society of Friends, usually called Quakers. He was concerned with Clarkson and others, in their labours against slavery—labours which, by the Divine blessing, were at last happily crowned with success. In this life we find (always excepting Church principles) the record of a good man's acts and feelings; and to those who wish to investigate the Anti-Slavery question, we can recommend the *Life of Mr. Phillips* as containing much important information.

1. *Adoration, Aspiration, and Belief.* By Eliza Flower. London: Chappel. 1842.

2. *The Garland.* By Mendelsohn Bartholdy. London: Ewer.

3. *I'll think then of thee.* By J. G. Lachner. London: Ewer.

THE success of Wilhelm's method of teaching singing, recently introduced into this country, bids fair to make us what we once were, a singing people; and we do not doubt that a very beneficial effect on the morals and manners of society will be thereby produced. To draw men from the pleasures of grosser sense, and familiarize them with the productions of genius in one of the noblest departments of art; to place within their reach a social gratification, which must refine their taste—such cannot fail to be the result of a well-founded popular instruction in music. To produce an effect so desirable, every possible encouragement ought to be given to works of real merit; for it is not from the frivolity which so often disgraces the Italian school, nor the mawkish sentimentality of modern ballads, utterly devoid of graceful melody, and carefully destitute of anything that could possibly be mistaken for harmony, that any good can come. From a careful study of the best works of the German school and our own old masters, with the immortal Purcell at their head, must our rising artists form their models. It is with much pleasure that we preface these remarks with the title of a work lately produced by an English lady, for it requires no great exercise of critical skill to point to Purcell and Mendelsohn as the objects of Miss Flower's ambition, and her great success is an ample proof of the propriety of her choice. We do not hesitate to pronounce this first part of "*Adoration, Aspiration, and Belief*," to exhibit genius of the highest order. Designed for several voices, they are finely harmonized, and vividly depict the feeling of the words, and are *dramatic*, without the smallest particle of the *theatrical*. The commencing piece is the beautiful and well-known moral of the ancient mariner—"He prayeth best who loveth best;" and it is certainly not praising it too highly to say, that Coleridge would have delighted to find his immortal verse so exquisitely clothed by the sister muse. "*Ancient of Ages*" shows Miss Flower's power over the sublime in sacred composition, and "*Gracious Power*," with the introductory recitative, "*God is a Spirit*," cannot fail to be admired for its eminently religious character. The whole concludes with "*Rest in Peace*," a composition which exhibits that ethereal repose which only the great artist is able to pourtray. We cannot conclude these remarks without adverting to the latitudinarian character of the verses, "*Gracious Power, the world pervading*"—they might have been

written by a disciple of Plato or Confucius, as well as by a Christian poet. We will only add, that most of these pieces can be sung by a single voice, or as duets, without injury to the sense, and that they are within the reach of most families who practice music. To turn to another class of compositions, the "Garland" of Mendelsohn is a very elegant little piece. First, we have the air, which is very pretty, and then a few bars in a sort of recitative, and then we have the air back again. This style of song-writing is very pleasing to English ears, and the "Garland" is sure to become a favourite. Mr. Lachner has given us a very polite answer to his former song, "Think of me," by his "I'll think then of thee;" there is a fine flowing character about the melody, and the accompaniments are rich, without being heavy; those written for the horn or violoncello, or violin or concertina, are admirable; and when we add, that the last, with very slight alteration, will do for the flute, it is certainly very strange if some one cannot always be found to blow or scrape it upon one of their instruments.

The Tongue of Time : or, the Language of a Church Clock.
By WILLIAM HARRISON, A.M. 8vo. London : Cradock and Co. 1841.

THIS is a very ingenious and attractive little work, which is well calculated to arrest the attention of the young, to whom it would furnish a pretty birth-day present, and also to point out the value of time. It contains a series of meditations on well-chosen texts of Scripture, arranged in the order of twelve hours on the dial-plate of a church-clock. The subjects are—I o'clock. "Watch"—the universal command. II., III. General duties: "Fear God"—"Honour all men." IV. "Be careful for nothing"—the Christian's temper in regard to this life. V. "The Lord is at hand"—comfort and warning. VI. "Why sleep ye? rise and pray"—the summons. VII. "Ask, and it shall be given you"—prayer. VIII. "I am the vine, ye are the branches"—the principle of grace. IX. "They that are Christ's, have crucified the flesh"—the principle of victory. X., XI. Particular duties—"Let your speech be alway with grace, seasoned with salt." "Walk in wisdom towards them that are without, redeeming the time." XII. "Here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come"—the look-out. The design and execution of this volume are equally creditable to the author.

Poems. By William Wordsworth. London: Moxon. 1842.

THE fame of Wordsworth is so well established, that we shall not occupy our space with any essay on his genius, but content ourselves by introducing to the notice of our readers a new volume of poems by the great poet of our age. For this early opportunity, we have to thank our kind friend Mr. Moxon, who has been well designated, by the finest wit of the day, as the "Publisher of the Poets," and the "Poet of the Publishers." This volume is doubly interesting from the fact of its containing poems composed at different periods during his long and eventful life. To very few of these gifted mortals has a similar fate been assigned. He may almost be said to enjoy his immortality in his life-time. He reaps the harvest of death without sowing the painful seed, for to the poets alone has the caprice of the world allotted the singular doom of *personal neglect*. While hundreds of guineas are given for an autograph of Shakspeare, the mental descendants of that great being are suffered to pine in want and obscurity! Human nature seems to rejoice in throwing away its sympathy and patronage on the dead, simply because it can give no pleasure or solace to the object of its blind attentions.

The volume before us contains a tragedy called "the Borderers," which we shall pass over now, intending to make it the subject of a future notice. We shall proceed to lay before our readers some extracts from this volume.

The first poem is entitled "Guilt and Sorrow," and is the longest in the book, occupying upwards of forty pages. Part of it has already been published under the title of "the Female Vagrant," and our readers may gather from this, the pervading tone of this fine production. The characters are of a very humble class—a peculiarity which has roused the bile of a race of critics, not inaptly styled the "*plated-fork school*," whose pretensions to "*gentility*" partake of the claim of their kindred forks—base spurious imitations. These base-metal specimens of human nature are not able to realize the fact, that wherever there is a human heart, there may be the abode of poetry, romance, and the finest feelings of the immortal spirit. Contrast Burns the ploughman, with the silken lords of the Bedchamber, with a bag-wig and a plaything sword—Milton the schoolmaster, in his majestic solitude, with some noble fop of Charles II.'s court—or, not to speak it profanely, Shakspeare himself, the woolstapler's son of Stratford, with Sir Christopher Hatton, the dancing knight, and great turner-out of his toes, in Elizabeth's reign; and, to carry it up to our own times, Wordsworth himself

with the Duke of this, or the Marquis of that, we shall soon be convinced of the possibility of poetry and romance dwelling out of the higher orders of conventional society! This aforesaid order of critics can hardly realize the fact of a poor man having a nervous system at all! as though sensibility were based on bank-notes, and human dignity on gold. We commence our extracts with the following beautiful and manly verses, composed at the grave of Burns. The touching pathos, and fearless sympathy with genius, cannot fail of producing a powerful effect on the reader's heart. There is no affectation of conventional cant. All is open and bracing as a fine breezy heath. It is the unbaring of a great poet's heart at the grave of a brother, whose sins were past, but whose genius was immortal. They evince the respect Wordsworth feels for kindred souls, and are worthy the happiest inspirations of his heart:—

“AT THE GRAVE OF BURNS—1803.

“ I SHIVER, Spirit fierce and bold,
At thought of what I now behold:
As vapours breathed from dungeons cold
Strike pleasure dead,
So sadness comes from out the mould
Where Burns is laid.

And have I, then, thy bones so near,
And thou forbidden to appear?
As if it were thyself that's here,
I shrink with pain;
And both my wishes and my fear
Alike are vain.

Off weight—nor press on weight! Away
Dark thoughts!—they came, but not to stay;
With chastened feelings would I pay
The tribute due
To him, and aught that hides his clay
From mortal view.

Fresh as the flower, whose modest worth
He sang, his genius “glinted” forth—
Rose like a star that touching earth,
For so it seems,
Doth glorify its humble birth
With matchless beams.

The piercing eye, the thoughtful brow,
The struggling heart—where be they now?
Full soon the Aspirant of the plough—
The prompt, the brave—
Slept, with the obscurest, in the low
And silent grave.

Well might I mourn that he was gone,
Whose light I hailed when first it shone,
When, breaking forth as nature's own,
 It showed my youth
How verse may build a princely throne
 On humble truth.

Alas ! where'er the current tends,
Regret pursues and with it blends—
Huge Criffel's hoary top ascends
 By Skiddaw sun.
Neighbours we were, and loving friends
 We might have been :

True friends, though diversely inclined ;
But heart with heart and mind with mind,
Where the main fibres are entwined,
 Through Nature's skill,
May even by contraries be joined
 More closely still.

The tear will start, and let it flow ;
Thou " poor inhabitant below,"
At this dread moment—even so—
 Might we together
Have sate and talked where gowans blow,
 Or on wild heather.

What treasures would have then been placed
Within my reach ; of knowledge graced
By fancy, what a rich repast !
 But why go on ?—
Oh ! spare to sweep, thou mournful blast,
 His grave grass-grown.

There, too, a son, his joy and pride,
(Not three weeks past the stripling died,)
Lies gathered to his father's side,
 Soul-moving sight !
Yet one to which is not denied
 Some sad delight.

For *he* is safe—a quiet bed
Hath early found among the dead,
Harboured where none can be misled,
 Wronged, or distress ;
And surely here it may be said
 That such are blest.

And, oh ! for thee, by pitying grace
Checked oft-times in a devious race,
May He who halloweth the place
 Where man is laid,
Receive thy spirit in the embrace
 For which it prayed !

Sighing I turned away ; but ere
 Night fell I heard, or seemed to hear,
 Music that sorrow comes not near—
 A ritual hymn,
 Chaunted in love that casts out fear,
 By Seraphim."

Few poets have been more distinguished for that wonderful blending of the practical and poetical than the author of "Peter Bell;" and as an additional illustration of this rare gift, we subjoin three sonnets, which, in our opinion, contain a mine of prudence; the admirable common sense, like a valuable jewel, is rendered more precious from the beauty and elaboration of the setting. These little poems are well worthy a close study: each contains a lecture on political economy, to which we should earnestly invite the attention of the violent men of all parties and sects.

"Ah, why deceive ourselves! by no mere fit
 Of sudden passion roused shall men attain
 True Freedom—where for ages they have lain,
 Bound in a dark abominable pit,
 With life's best sinews more and more unknit.
 Here, there, a banded few, who loathe the chain,
 May rise to break it—effort worse than vain,
 For thee, O great Italian nation, split
 Into those jarring fractions. Let thy scope
 Be one fixed mind for all; thy rights approve
 To thy own conscience gradually renewed;
 Learn to make Time the father of wise Hope;
 Then trust thy cause to the arm of Fortitude,
 The light of Knowledge, and the warmth of Love.

Hard task! exclaimed the undisciplined, to lean
 On patience, coupled with such slow endeavour,
 That long-lived servitude must last for ever.
 Perish, the grovelling few, who, prest between
 Wrongs and the terror of redress, would wean
 Millions from glorious aims. Our chains to sever,
 Let us break forth in tempest, now or never!
 What! is there then no space for golden mean
 And gradual progress?—twilight leads to day,
 And even within the burning zones of earth
 The hastiest sunrise yields a temperate ray;
 The softest breeze to fairest flowers gives birth.
 Think not that Prudence dwells in dark abodes—
 She scans the future with the eyes of gods.

As leaves are to the tree whereon they grow,
 And wither, every human generation
 Is to the being of a mighty nation,
 Locked in our world's embrace through weal and woe;

Thought that should teach the zealot to forego
 Base schemes, to abjure all selfish agitation,
 And seek, through noiseless pains and moderation,
 The unblemished good they only can bestow.
 Alas ! with most, who weigh futurity
 Against time present, passion holds the scales ;
 Hence equal ignorance of both prevails,
 And nations sink ; or, struggling to be free,
 Are doomed to founder on, like wounded whales,
 Tossed on the bosom of a stormy sea."

We have all of us heard of the "School of Wordsworth," as though he were a great mannerist, and not a poet, or, at all events, a poet great by mannerism. It has been the cant of all ages, when a writer has distinguished himself by his genius, to say, "He has a peculiarity;" as though his strength were a foible ! We might with as much propriety declare that we could distinguish nature from art, by her peculiarity of impressing you with the feeling that she was more real and pleasant than a painting, and then ignorantly go on learnedly to discourse on the mannerism of nature—that her fields were *always* so very green—her clear skies *always* so remarkably *blue*—and her water *always* so decidedly *wet*.

We notice in this volume "The Cuckoo and Nightingale," modernized from Chaucer, and which first appeared in a volume published two years since, which deserved a far larger patronage than, we fear, the public has bestowed on it. We allude to "Chaucer Modernized,"* which contains some of that fine old poet's finest compositions.

To return, however, to the more immediate subject of our review. The peculiar tone of Wordsworth's mind is very conspicuous in the verses on his brother's death by shipwreck. We can quote nothing more characteristic of that wonderful association of idea than these lines ; each contains a mine from whence the richest pleasure may be extracted. How deeply does Wordsworth probe into the innermost recesses of the human heart, and how entirely are its profoundest workings laid bare !

" ELEGIAC VERSES IN MEMORY OF MY BROTHER, JOHN WORDSWORTH.

1805.

" The sheep-boy whistled loud, and lo !
 That instant, startled by the shock,
 The buzzard mounted from the rock,
 Deliberate and slow ;

* "Chaucer Modernized." By William Wordsworth, R. H. Horne, Leigh Hunt, Thomas Powell, Miss E. B. Barrett, Robert Bell, &c. Whittaker. 1841.

Lord of the air he took his flight.
 Oh ! could he on that woeful night
 Have lent his wing, my brother dear,
 For one poor moment's space to thee,
 And all who struggled with the sea,
 When safety was so near !

Thus in the weakness of my heart
 I spoke (but let that pang be still),
 When rising from the rock at will,
 I saw the bird depart ;
 And let me calmly bless the Power
 That meets me in this unknown flower :
 Affecting type of him I mourn !
 With calmness suffer and believe,
 And grieve, and know that I must grieve,
 Not cheerless, but forlorn."

How characteristically is the poet drawn from the flight of the bird to the unassuming flower—from strength to weakness—and finds consolation in helpless beauty. How finely is the tale of bereavement told in a line :—

"Sea—ship—drowned—shipwreck—so it came,
 The meek, the brave, the good, was gone."

And mark the depth, the pathos of affection :—

"He who had been our living John
 Was nothing but a name."

The feelings of the brother are strongly depicted in the next stanza, and the tone of his mind illustrated by his return to the contemplation of the simple flower :—

"That was, indeed, a parting ! oh,
 Glad am I, glad that it is past ;
 For there were some on whom it cast
 Unutterable woe.
 But they as well as I have gains ;
 From many a humble source, to pains
 Like these, there comes a mild release ;
 Even here I feel it—even this plant
 Is in its beauty ministrant
 To comfort and to peace."

Who is there that has not *felt* glad, even in the midst of unutterable woe ? It is this very feeling that enables us to support it, and prompts us to look through the cloud to a bright sun beyond.

We had intended a few remarks on the series of sonnets entitled "On the Punishment of Death ;" but we forbear,

unwilling to mar with the expression of dissatisfaction the unfeigned pleasure this volume has afforded us. We express here no contrary opinion ourselves—we are not inclined to condemn the advocacy of capital punishments, but we are sorry to see it advocated *in poetry*. We must also caution our readers against drawing the conclusion, that we question the undoubted right of so great an intellect to maintain his own judgment on any subject, whether of politics or morals; we simply question the propriety of *dragging* so dire a necessity as capital punishment into the *poetical* kingdom.

We cannot forbear expressing our satisfaction at the proud position which Wordsworth now occupies: the smallness of a Jeffrey and Brougham, as critics, is amusingly contrasted by the greatness of the poet's fame, whose chief work they flippantly pronounced "would never do;" a colloquialism worthy of any ship-boy in the modern Athens.

This reminds us of an anecdote, which pithily puts the question in a proper point of view. Soon after the publication of "*Roderick*," Southey received a letter from Hogg (who through life retained in full vigour his homeliness, and somewhat also of officiousness), giving an account of his endeavours to obtain for Southey's new poem a favourable review, adding, in a kind of ludicrous simplicity or idiotcy—"I suppose you have heard what a crushing review Jeffrey has given Wordsworth." To this laughable remark Southey replied in a fine tone of scornful irony—"Jeffrey crush the *Excursion*! Tell him he might as easily crush Skiddaw!"

We cannot better conclude this review than by transcribing the following noble sonnet—

"Thou soul of grandeur in humanity,
With humbleness so dignified; whose power
Is sympathy with Virtue, placing thee
Upon a just, tho' late apparent throne,
High in the immortal, amaranthine bower,
Whence the Great Living on the earth gaze down,
Perchance with tears, such as thou oft hast shed;
The clouds have burst—men see thy star-crowned head!
Thou lov'st no morbid gloom where sphinxes glare,
Nor picturesque externals!—solemnly seen,
A human heart to thee pants and lies bare.
Bard of pure Nature's heroism serene,
Thou rul'st an ocean where no wrecks have been—
Bow, Time, reprov'd, to his sublime grey hair."

R. H. HORNE, 1837.

Roman Misquotation ; or, certain Passages from the Fathers, adduced in a Work entitled, " The Faith of Catholics," &c., brought to the test of the originals, and their perverted character demonstrated. By the Rev. Richard T. P. Pope, A.M. London : Holdsworth. 1840. 8vo.

THE author of this volume has rendered very great service to those who are engaged in controversial discussion with the Papists; and his work furnishes an additional proof of the explaining-away system of interpretation to which they have reverted, and which was so fully exposed in our last number. "The Faith of Catholics confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers of the five first centuries of the Church," occupies no ordinary place in the estimation of Roman Ecclesiastics. It was compiled by Messrs. Kirk and Berington, two Romish priests, in 1813; and in 1830 Mr. Kirk produced a new edition, with large additions. It has long enjoyed a high reputation among Romanists, and is the manual which has supplied quotations from the Fathers to Papal controversialists, especially to the late Dr. Poynter, titular Bishop of Halia, and to Dr. Trevern, Bishop of the Romish Church at Strasburg, who has been so completely refuted by the veteran author, the Rev. G. S. Faber, in his "Difficulties of Romanism." Mr. Pope's volume does not profess to be an examination of all the quotations contained in the so called "Faith of Catholics." He has confined his laborious researches to the three topics of "The Authority of the Church," "Prayers for the Dead," and "Transubstantiation." The passages pretended to be quoted by Messrs. Kirk and Berington are compared with the works of the original authors, and in the identical editions which they profess to cite, the result is the *demonstration* of the fact, that a volume in no small repute among Romanists, has, in support of papal dogmas, imposed on the community GARBLED EXTRACTS from the writings of the Fathers. How Mr. Kirk will digest this detection of *his* wilful mutilations of these writings, we know not. (Mr. Berington, we believe, has been dead some years.) But Mr. Pope largely deserves the thanks of all who are engaged in defending our Church against popish aggressions, and no well-assorted theological library ought to be without his work.

Manasseh ; a Tale of the Jews. London : Hatchards. 1842. WHEN we opened this volume, we were struck with the character of the illustrations. Where they come from we cannot tell; they certainly are not unpleasing, and the narrative is both curious and instructive.

The Life of the Rev. Charles Wesley, M.A., sometime Student of Christ Church, Oxford; comprising a Review of his Poetry, Sketches of the Rise and Progress of Methodism, with notices of contemporary events and characters. By Thomas Jackson. 2 vols. London: Mason. 1841.

WHEN, some numbers ago, we treated at length on the nature and effects of Wesleyan Methodism, we spoke largely on the character and conduct of John Wesley; but we had less space for noticing those of his brother than we could have wished, and also less materials from which to judge of him. The handsome volumes before us supply exactly the desideratum; and had we possessed them when we made that sketch, we should have enlarged on the position and exertions of Charles Wesley to a much greater extent. We have unavoidably delayed our notice till the present number, not from any disinclination to renew our acquaintance with either Mr. Jackson or the Wesleys, but from a pressure of matter of more immediate importance to the Church. Mr. Jackson may be called, in an especial manner, the historian of Methodism, and is probably one of the best-read and most useful men in the connexion. His style is pleasing, and his occasional remarks pertinent; but when we consider the numbers and importance of the body to which he belongs, we shall at once see how interesting is the history of its origin to those who desire to take a comprehensive and correct view of the religion of our day. The Church is acted upon in many ways by those without her pale; the political practice of men, too, is greatly affected by their ecclesiastical views; and here also we recognize the importance of being thoroughly acquainted with the modifications of zeal and churchmanship produced by such causes from without. It is not our purpose here to enter into an analysis of Mr. Jackson's work—suffice it to say, that with the strong predilection in favour of Wesleyanism, which necessarily exhibits itself in all his writings, he combines candour, courtesy, and a large measure of genuine Christian charity. We remark, that he is displeased with the editor of Lady Huntingdon's memoirs, because the latter represents Charles Wesley as less opposed than his brother to Calvinism. We think Mr. Jackson rather too severe on this topic, though no one who knows aught of the feelings and sentiments of Charles Wesley, could suppose him to be one whit less opposed than was John, to the tenets of Calvin. The biography of a truly good man, endowed with high natural talents and no small acquired advantages, must of itself be interesting. In the case of Charles Wesley there is superadded a career of extraordinary activity, considerable adventure, and a

share, a prominent one too, in the formation of the greatest (will Mr. Jackson pardon us for the word) schism that England has ever seen. The appendices are valuable in some points of view, but full of unsound opinions as to Church matters; and while we set a high value on the work, we regard it, like the memoirs of Lady Huntingdon, rather in the light of what the French call "*Memoires pour servir a l'histoire*" than as history itself. We must not omit to notice that there is a good portrait of Charles Wesley in the first volume.

Catholicity versus Sibthorp; or some help to answer the question whether the Rev. R. Sibthorp, B.D., is now or ever was a Catholic. In a series of Letters addressed to him by the Rev. G. E. Biber, LL.D. London: Rivingtons. 1842.

To all those persons whose faith has been injured by Mr. Sibthorp's secession *from* THE CATHOLIC *to the* ROMAN Church, we most earnestly recommend a perusal of Dr. Biber's truly admirable letters. Had they been earlier published, we should have made them the subject of a lengthened investigation; but we have not space remaining for that, and long before the appearance of our next number, Mr. Sibthorp and his apostacy will be forgotten. Dr. Biber is very, very severe, but not more so than a Christian ought to be, and very plainly proves that Mr. Sibthorp not only is not now, but that he never was a Catholic.

A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. Parts XXIV., XXV., XXVI. London: Taylor and Walton. 1842.

WHEN this work is completed, and it is now very rapidly advancing towards its close, we shall devote an article to the consideration of it, and the subjects it embraces; meanwhile we are pleased that we can cordially recommend it as a most valuable contribution to our antiquarian literature. From the more frequent recurrence of the initials L. S. we augur well for its improvement, and hope that Dr. Schmitz will have as large a share in the Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology.

Confessions of an Apostate. By the Author of "*Felix de Lisle*." London: Seeleys. 1842.

WERE we to say that we object to religious fictions in general, we should, perhaps, say too much. We object, however, to the insufficient views taken by the writer before us. It is not by such that the Tractarian heresy can be overthrown.

1. *Canadian Scenery*, Parts XX., XXI., XXII. London: Virtue. 1842.
2. *Scenery and Antiquities of Ireland*. Parts IX., X., XI., XII. London: Virtue. 1842.

THAT these splendid works are published at all, and especially that they can be sold at a price so moderate, is a proof that, whatever may be said as to the state of the Fine Arts, there is no want of appreciation of them whenever they are brought within the reach of the many. The series of the Irish scenery is particularly beautiful; and we would especially call attention to the Gap of Dunloe, in No. 12, as a really fine specimen of art. Mr. Virtue deserves high praise for the manner in which he sends forth these very elegant pictorials.

Winkle's Cathedrals. Illustrations of the Cathedral Churches of England and Wales. Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. Vol. III. London: Tilt and Bogue. 1842.

WHEN the former series of this beautiful work, concluding the second volume, was brought to a close, we feared that it would never be resumed. We are, however, agreeably disappointed, and are bound to confess that the third volume will be better than either of the other two. The stern majesty of that vast pile, the Cathedral at Durham, has, in a more especial manner, attracted us in the representation; and we think that a service is done to the cause of ecclesiastical architecture by the publication of works like the present, which must familiarize the mind with its noblest specimens.

The Kings of the East: an Exposition of the Prophecies determining from Scripture and from History the Power from whom the mystical Euphrates is being dried up; with an explanation of certain other Prophecies concerning the restoration of Israel. London: Seeleys. 1842.

THE immense extent of the Anglo-Indian empire, and the vast power for good or evil which is thereby thrown into the hands of the British nation, will justify any call made upon us as to the manner in which that power should be wielded. Hence, while we pretend not to explain the yet unfulfilled prophecies, we quite agree with the author of the work before us as to the awful responsibility which our rules incur. The book is written in a calm and Christian spirit, as well as a thoughtful and studious one.

Acta Concilii Tridentini. Anno MDLXII. et MDLXIII. usque in finem Concilii Pio IV. Pont. Max. et Alia Multa circa dictum Concilium fragmenta. A Gabriele Cardinale Paleotto descripta, nunc primum in lucem vindicata e Codice MS. olim penes Fridericum Comitem de Guilford. Edente Josepho Mendham, M.A. Londini: Duncan. 1842.

THE Council of Trent, that extraordinary synod, which (while the Anglican Church was gradually liberating herself from the chains of Popery,) was riveting those chains on the necks of the followers of Rome, that extraordinary synod has never yet had its published history from authority. Paleotto, afterwards a cardinal, was present during the whole council, as auditor of the rota; and he has preserved the actual deliberations. Various causes, but chiefly the fears of the court of Rome, have hitherto suppressed these "acta," and they are now for the first time printed. The late Earl of Guilford had possession of a MS. copy, from which Mr. Mendham has taken the text of his edition. It is difficult to say how important may be the effects of such a publication as this. In Germany, as well as in England, in Italy, and, under the present aspect of affairs, in Spain also, the revelation of what was really done and said at the council of Trent, must have great weight. That council is, in fact, the pivot upon which the whole papacy turns, and the work of Mr. Mendham, a competent scholar and a good divine, by enlightening us as to the foundation, will show us also what is the true character of the superstructure.

The Works of William Jay. Vols. I. and II. London: Bartlett. 1842.

WE are well known to be no friends to Dissent, or, indeed, *as such* to Dissenters; but we feel pleasure in speaking well of a book by a Dissenter when we can do so, even if it be only to prove our impartiality. William Jay, of Bath, has been for many years one of the most popular of Dissenting teachers, and his writings, while not profound, are both pleasing and practical. The volumes before us, the first two of a collected edition of his works, contain the morning and evening exercises for the year; and the only fault we have to find with them is the absurdity of their title. Reader, know that these are not Latin or Greek exercises for school-boys, but portions of Scripture with practical reflections for each morning and evening. Such, however, is the dissenting term, and, excepting this, we have no fault to find. They are pious and judicious.

The Harmony of Protestant Confessions, exhibiting the Faith of the Churches of Christ reformed after the pure and holy doctrine of the Gospel throughout Europe. Translated from the Latin. A new Edition, revised and considerably enlarged. By the Rev. Peter Hall, M.A. London: Shaw. 1842.

MR. HALL has here given us an enlarged and useful edition of a work which is absolutely necessary to all who would rightly understand the grounds of the continental reformation. We see by means of this compilation what was esteemed essential and what only important, what was allowed as an open question, and what considered as a constituent part of Christ's Gospel, by the continental reformers. Their errors, too, as well as their excellences, may here be read in their own words—not out of the mouth of enemies. The book is well printed, and is a useful addition to the Theological literature of the day.

Parochial Sermons. By the Rev. W. Gresley, M.A., Prebendary of Lichfield. London: Burns. 1842.

THOSE who know how difficult it is to excite and keep up the attention of a congregation, and how much clap-trap and unsound *ad captandum* discussion is resorted to for the production of this effect will thank Mr. Gresley for a volume of calm, wise, and purely English Sermons. The subjects of course vary, but the teaching of the Church runs throughout them all. We have this holy institution of Christ placed upon its proper footing, and our duties as members thereof admirably explained and enforced. This is no light praise; for those who in other respects act with Mr. Gresley not unfrequently “darken counsel by words without knowledge.” He is a High Churchman—let us say a sound Catholic, without (so far as we have read his works) advocating all the views of “THE TRACTS.”

The Old Testament, with a Commentary, consisting of short Lectures for the daily use of Families. By the Rev. Charles Girdlestone, M.A., Rector of Alderley, Cheshire. Part VIII., Ezekiel to Malachi. London: Rivingtons. 1842.

MR. GIRDLESTONE's useful commentary is now, we are glad to see, brought prosperously to its conclusion. It is simply practical, and makes no pretensions to either critical or theological eminence. We do not exactly see what need there was of it; but Mr. Girdlestone we suppose did, or he would not have written it. Our sole objection is, that it is just such a commentary as a person with ordinary abilities and some degree of fluency could make extempore before breakfast.

Ecclesiastica, the Church, her Schools and her Clergy. By Edward Mahon Roose, of Lincoln's Inn, Esq. London: Hatchards. 1842.

THIS volume is so well intentioned, and, in spite of its many inaccuracies, so readable, that we are very unwilling to speak otherwise than well of it. We wish, however, that the author had left the *living* divines alone—they do not want praise. We shall make an extract which will exemplify our meaning:—

“ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE was born in 1805, and received, we believe, his preparatory education under the paternal roof. When properly qualified, he was sent to Oriel College, Oxford, where he most respectably acquitted himself. In 1826, he took the degree of B.A., and soon after abandoned his academical career, and married a daughter of the Rev. John Sargent. In 1829, Mr. Wilberforce obtained a curacy in the neighbourhood of Oxford, and subsequently preferred, through the interest of Lord Brougham, to the rectory of Brightstone, in the Isle of Wight, where he still frequently resides. In 1830, the Bishop of Winchester appointed him to the archdeaconry of Surrey, which is considered to be worth about 2000*l.* per annum.

“The archdeacon, who is said to have a slight tendency to Tractarianism, is a talented and useful preacher. His voice is rather pleasing than powerful, but he sometimes uses a recurrence of the same cadence, which wearies as much as monotony, and his language is rather easy than energetic. Although enjoying a high reputation from his clerical activity and utility, and possessing more than ordinary abilities, he is yet indebted for most of his celebrity and advancement in the Church to the name which he bears.”

This is very objectionable. The account of Mr. Mc'Neile, which is too long to quote, is still more so, and we hope to see the day when these incitements to a morbid curiosity shall cease to exist.

Eight Letters concerning the Blessed Trinity. By John Wallis, D.D., formerly Savilian Professor at the University of Oxford. A new edition, with the Author's last revisions and corrections, together with a Preface and Notes. By Thomas Flintoff. London: Rivingtons. 1842.

THE letters of Dr. Wallis are too well known to need either praise or description here, and we are glad to see them reprinted as they are, by corrections and revision from the author himself. It appears that to James Crossley, Esq., of Manchester, a gentleman whose name is a sufficient guarantee of soundness and learning, this book owes its chief additional merit. We wish it success.

Congregationalism ; or the Polity of Independent Churches viewed in relation to the State and Tendencies of modern Society. By Robert Vaughan, D.D. Jackson : London and Walford. 1842.

WE expected to have found more in this book than it really contains, and yet it is the most wonderful book that Dissent ever produced. Dr. Vaughan appears to have come, and come rightly, to the conclusion, that the old practice of showing the Churches of the apostolic age to have been congregational, or as it used to be called "Independent," was a mistake ; and that it would not do to revive an exploded theory. So we shall hear no more of the *apostolicity* of Dissent. "But (says the learned Doctor) we have not done yet—no, we have a great gun to fire. If Dissent be not in accordance with the precepts and practice of the apostles, it is, at all events, in accordance with the state and tendencies of modern society," *i. e.*, with the kingdom of this world. We do not deny the fact, but we are rather surprised at Dr. Vaughan's acknowledgment. Let us not be mistaken ; we are not quoting the Doctor's language, but putting the scope of his book into our own. It is necessary to explain this, or we shall have a third volume written against us.

Dr. Vaughan is excessively irate with us for our criticisms upon his "History of the Stuarts," and taxes us with unfairness in no very measured language. He says, moreover, that the articles in question were written by a gentleman well known in the literary and ecclesiastical world, and whose *name* he brings forward, contrary to all the courtesies of literary society. Whether the assignment be true or not, we recognize the proceeding as a common trick of the class to which Dr. Vaughan belongs, and we—not the gentleman in question—deliberately reassert all that those articles contained, and tax Dr. Vaughan in addition with wilfully misrepresenting them in his book, by taking *one* passage of the review, and applying it to a passage in his own work to which it was *not* meant to apply, carefully concealing at the same time those passages to which it *does* apply. No doubt, Dr. Vaughan is "an honourable man," and his employers, "and so are they *all* honourable men." As to his attack upon Dr. Todd, it is very silly ; and when he writes again we only wish him better sense, better taste, and better temper.

A Plain and Practical View of the Liturgy. By the Rev. Hervey Marriott, Rector of Claverton. London : Hatchards.

MR. MARRIOTT seems to understand the Liturgy pretty well, but we confess we do not see any reason for the publication of a book which does but say what many scores of others have said better before.

The Church and State Gazette. Nos. I. to V. London: Painter.

It would be false delicacy were we to abstain from expressing our entire approbation of this excellent periodical, for no other reasons than because it emanates from our own publisher, and has praised our own labours. We have long wished to see such a paper, and we shall do our utmost to support it. We have no interest in it otherwise than the interest of the truth. We know not even the names of its conductors, nor of a single writer engaged in its management. All we know is, that it began by promising well, and hitherto it has performed its promises.

“The title of our *GAZETTE* (say its editors) will explain its objects. In professing a desire to maintain the union of Church and State, we exclude all principles and views hostile to the established institutions of the empire. We have no sympathy either with the adversaries of the Reformation, or with the champions of the Reformation, in opposition to primitive truth. We war against all doctrines, the tendencies whereof are on the one hand to Popery, and on the other to Dissent and sectarianism. We surrender, however, to neither party the title of *Catholic* or that of *Evangelical*. We support the State as the nursing-parent of the Church, and the Church as the guide and counsellor of the State. We believe that the empire has prospered, under Divine Providence, in proportion as Church and State have understood and fulfilled these their respective functions—in proportion as they have appreciated the design of their union—in proportion as each has strengthened each—and especially in proportion as the State has become religious. Believing, moreover, that the vast majority of the reflecting, the educated, and the pious people of this country concur in these views, of which we do not perceive in the public press any adequate representative, we have entered the field and established our newspaper.”

This portion of the public, and of the Church—the *Old English Catholic*—has now a weekly organ, and one which we most sincerely trust it will support. For three months, 12,000 copies will be gratuitously distributed weekly, and by that time we hope to see the *Gazette* firmly established. The conductors remark—

“A very large outlay will be incurred by this *gratuitous* distribution of upwards of *twelve thousand* copies *weekly* for *three months*. We, therefore, trust that all persons, who approve our labours, will feel a special obligation to extend the circulation of the *Gazette* as widely as possible. All men—not the clergy alone—must perceive that a great amount of good will accrue by the dissemination of sound views in the manufacturing, no less than in the rural districts, wherein the worst publications—*Sunday Newspapers*—advocating democratic and demoralizing principles, have obtained an extensive and a pernicious circulation.”

Most sincerely do we hope that the expectations so rationally formed will not be disappointed, and that the Church may long find in the *Church and State Gazette* an able and zealous advocate.

The Music of the Church, in four parts. By Thomas Hirst, London: Whittaker. 1841.

THE object of this publication is to throw a light on the subject of Church music; and it professes to contain “a general history of music,” “an account of Hebrew music,” “an investigation into the fitness of instruments, harmony, fuguing, anthems, chants, choirs, &c. &c., in divine worship, and notes biographical and critical *of* (*sic*) the most popular hymnic authors.” All this in 357 pages!! This marvellously reminds us of the celebrated work, “*de omnibus rebus, et quibusdam aliis*,” in one vol. 32mo. That book we, however, believe to be a myth—a centaur, a sort of Kentucky-man, half horse, half earthquake, and half alligator, and to be ranked with those dragons and griffins, sphinxes and cockatrices, which people alike the coats of the noble and the books of the learned. Mr. Hirst’s work is, however, a *verum ens*, and so may be criticised; but we dare not be severe, for Mr. Hirst exposes our ignorance, and shows how incompetent we are to speak on such topics as those which he treats. We are, however, greatly comforted at being told that we are “a respectable periodical.” Now, however, in return for this piece of civility, let us assure Mr. Hirst, who is “a respectable Wesleyan,” that his volume contains many good hints, and many useful pieces of information, and if it were circulated widely among his brethren, it would tend to render their psalmody much more “respectable” than it is. He has our good opinion, and shall have our good word.

Foxe’s Book of Martyrs. Parts VIII., XI., X., XI. London: Virtue. 1842.

MR. CUMMING’S edition, enriched as it is with very pleasing plates, and brought out periodically, will, we doubt not, be rendered very acceptable to the non-critical portion of the reading public by the continued exertions made by the members of the Roman Church. To the scholar, who wishes to consult a book of authority, we are sorry to say there is yet no edition of the “*Acts and Monuments*.” This does not profess to be one; nor indeed is Mr. Cumming the person to undertake such an one. Such as it is, however, we are glad to see the present work, and heartily wish it success.

The Office and Work of the Holy Spirit. By the Rev. James Buchanan. Edinburgh: Johnstone. 1842.

MR. BUCHANAN has compressed into this little volume the substance of many larger ones. We do not speak of its originality, but this is a quality extremely rare, and really this is more than an average specimen of what is now published as divinity.

Palmer's Map of Arabia Petræa, The Holy Land, and part of Egypt, designed chiefly to illustrate those parts of the Old Testament which relate to the Exodus and Journeyings of the Israelites, and their settlement in the Land of Promise. London: 1842.

THIS map is, we suppose, published by Mr. Baisler, of Oxford-street, inasmuch as it is from his hands that it reaches us. We mention this because no publisher's name is appended to it. We have examined it with great care, and find it to be both accurate and comprehensive. The geological notices here and there scattered over it are particularly valuable, and we know of no more useful guide to the right understanding of the Scripture history than this excellent map. Its extent is such that it embraces every town of note, and the scene of every important transaction recorded in Holy Writ. Nor is it altogether unworthy of remark, that the map is elegantly got up, that it is well coloured, and that its whole appearance is such as to recommend it.

If all students of Scripture approve of it as much as we do, Mr. Palmer will find his labours by no means unprofitable.

The Lost Brooch ; or the History of another Month. A Tale for Young People. By the Author of the "Fairy Bower." London: Burns. 1842.

WHEN we read the "Fairy Bower," we were struck with the ability which it displayed; but we saw also, that the author was so much absorbed in the tale as to forget that the actors were but children, and that the interest and importance attached to their proceedings by so large a portion of society as that represented in the story, was quite inconsistent. The present is the continuation of the adventures of the same individuals, and as they advance in age they become more interesting. The tale is well managed, and the characters well drawn.

Sintram and his Companions ; a Northern Tale. From the German of the Baron de la Motte Fouqué. London: Burns.

THE tales of La Motte Fouqué are often extremely beautiful, and few more so than those in which he has recourse to the ancient North for the subject matter of his theme. "Sintram" is an excellent specimen, and its beauty is by no means its only, or even its chief, recommendation. The moral and the religious instruction conveyed in it are alike valuable.

POETRY AND MUSIC.

1. *The Christian Month, a series of original Hymns ; adapted from the Daily Psalms, with Chants and Anthems, including a new National Anthem.* The Poetry by the Rev. Wm. Palin, B.A., Rector of Stifford, Essex—the Music by Miss Mounsey. London : Ollivier. 1842.
2. *Select English Poetry ; designed for the use of Schools and Young Persons in general.* London : Jackson and Walford. 1842.
3. *Verses by a Poor Man.* Dedicated, by express permission, to his Royal Highness Prince Albert. London : Painter.
4. *Scraps from the Knapsack of a Soldier ; consisting of Bre-
vities in Verse.* By Calder Campbell, Author of the “Palmer’s Last Lesson,” and “Lays from the East.” London : Mitchell.
5. *Ovid’s Epistles in English Verse, with some Original Poems.* Dedicated, by permission, to the Venerable Archdeacon Wrangham. By Miss Emma Garland (daughter of the late Richard Garland, Esq., Hull). London : Rivingtons. 1842.
6. *Zaida ; a Tale of Granada, and Minor Poems.* By Lewis Evans, Author of “The Pleasures of Benevolence.” London : Houlston and Stoneman. 1842.
7. *The Christian Offering.* By George B. Scott. London :
Virtue. 1842.

SURELY it will never be said that the present is an age in which no attempts are made in poetry. The number of volumes annually put forth in verse is very great, but, alas, the quantity of poetry they contain is woefully small. Of the seven volumes before us we will at once get rid of the selection by saying that it is a good one, and of the tale “Zaida,” by frankly acknowledging our conviction, that if the author had been wisely advised, it would never have appeared. He cannot expect to sell many copies, and the small number of subscribers will never pay his expenses. That, however, is *his* business, not ours ; and we find little in the poem to reward perusal. The hymns of Mr. Palin are well written, with much ease and gracefulness of expression. We take a very pleasing poem, viz., a new national anthem, to warrant our assertion ; it is one which we think ought to be, and will be, very popular :—

Hear us ! oh Lord of all,
Hear us ! on thee we call,
God save the Queen.
Shield her from every care,
Blessings for her prepare,
Join all in England’s prayer—
God save the Queen.

Guard thou her honoured crown,
Circled with old renown,
Guard and maintain.
Reigning in every breast,
From every foe at rest,
By every Briton blest,
Long may she reign.

Her noble line increase—
 Give to them strength and peace,
 Long may they stand!
 May Britain, great and free,
 Swayed by their sceptre be,
 Loyal and loved of thee—
 Lord bless our Land!
 May heaven on Albert smile!
 Welcome to freedom's isle,
 Albert shall be.
 Prince! honoured be thy name,

Let virtue be thy fame,
 Joyful we all proclaim,
 Welcome to thee.
 Hail! heir of England's throne,
 Hail! England's noblest son—
 Thy foes shall fall.
 May wisdom be thy guide,
 All hearts in love allied,
 Hail thee Old England's pride!
 God save us all!

The music of this is, of course, the *National Anthem*. The other airs are well composed and well arranged. We have tried them, and can recommend them as a very pleasing addition to psalmody, both in families and churches. Mr. Scott's "*Christian Offering*" is a book intended for presenting to friends. There is much elegant composition in it, and here and there we find snatches of true poetry. The book would have been decidedly better without the pictures.

Come we now to a very adventurous volume: no less than a translation by a lady of "the heroic epistles." There is, however, no indelicacy, and little of pretension, about it. We fear that we cannot award it larger praise. The two other volumes on our list will require some longer notice, for they are unquestionably of a higher order. The "*Verses by a Poor Man*" form an eccentric volume, giving evidence of indisputable talent, and likely, we think, to be acceptable with the poor as well as the rich. The Poor Man is a daring innovator, and writes just as he would talk. What shall be said of the following effusion:—

"THE POOR MAN GIVETH THE READER A PIECE OF HIS MIND
 ABOUT MASHED POTATOES.

"Potatoes mashed are an excellent thing,
 And fit for the table of even a king.
 When the poor man returns from his daily work,
 He hears not the sound of the rich man's cork;
 He smells not the smell of the rich man's venison,
 But mashed potatoes, and asks a benison.
 Potatoes and salt, and peace and rest,
 Are the poor man's lot—and he is blest.
 But if this book should happen to sell,
 I will then have a piece of bacon as well."

Poetry it is not: the Poor Man does not imagine it to be so.

Yet we have no objection to it. It indicates a right state of mind, and everything that does this is good. Once more—

“ But of all the noble feathered fowls
A goose must be preferred :
There is so much of nourishment
In that weak-minded bird.”

This is exquisitely absurd taken by itself, but it is by no means out of place in this singular volume. We might cull many such specimens, but we think the experiment here made a bold one, and, *though it will not bear repetition*, a successful one. It is the quiet talking of a cottager, healthy-minded and poetical withal, filled with a love of nature and of virtue, and stirred from within by aspirations after the pure and the beautiful for its own sake. Religion, too, is the subject of the Poor Man's discourses, and he is never more in his element than when drawing forth its hidden stores from visible things. But it must be borne in mind that the Poor Man has received no technical education: he reads his own books, and thinks his own thoughts, but, in the vulgar phrase, he is *uneducated*; and the absence of that education, and the non-perception, therefore, of what is required by those who have it, make the book so singular, so pleasing to the philosopher, and to the ill-natured critic so ridiculous. An eclipse of the sun gives the Poor Man an opportunity of moralizing, which he embraces, and speaks as follows:—

“ THE POOR MAN TALKETH ABOUT THE SUN BEING DARKENED.

“ A long time ago, while gathering chips,
I saw what philosophers call an eclipse ;
And some of them said how the matter was done
By the moon stepping in 'twixt the earth and the sun :
And clearly explained how the principal cause
Agreed with some new mathematical laws :
While others made accurate calculations
The eclipse would be seen by such and such nations,
And how many of them could take place each year.
Now the poor man (it happened) was standing near :
' May it please you (said I) to tell me when
The sun will be darkened, nor brighten again ?'
Not all the deep learning of man can tell
The hidden things of heaven and hell !
You may think of the science of each eclipse,
While I, the poor man, am gathering chips ;
But the darkened sun is a lesson to me
To prepare for the life of eternity ;
And as for the time when that shall be,
God has not made you much wiser than me ;
But I draw a deep thought from the dark eclipse,
With a beating breast and a prayer on my lips.”

This is exactly an illustration of what we mean. The same ideas in the metre of an ordinary verse-maker would have made a rather striking, and certainly very pleasing, poem; here we have it "in the rough."

Yet we find from time to time positive *imitations* of other poets. Take an example—

"THE POOR MAN SHOWETH HOW MEMORY GOT UP AND WENT A WALKING.

"Bright was the morning,
In nature's adorning,
When Memory rose from her dreamy bed;
Over the hills,
With their purling rills,
In her streaming delicate robes, she fled.

Hard by a fountain,
At the foot of a mountain,
A sweet little girl was lingering there;
Her large blue eye
Was pure as the sky,
And roses were wreathed in her silky hair.

In accents gay
She was singing a lay,
And its burden was something like "Happy Hours."
She was my sister,
The breezes kissed her,
She fled away to the green-wood bowers."

This is as palpable an imitation of Shelley as any one could desire to see. What follows it is less so. There are many poems, too, here, which are more, shall we say *refined*. Nor do we remember any verses of Bloomfield, to be compared with the lines which we shall here adduce, and which form the first half of a poem without a title. The metre is Milton's, and one of the most exquisitely beautiful that any language can boast; it is, however, difficult; and it is no little praise to say that the Poor Man has not mismanaged its solemn cadences:—

"When from the gray church tower
At day's most solemn hour,
The sound of evening bells in tremulous motion
Now sinks, now rises high,
As float the breezes by,
Like changing waves upon the azure ocean,
When the sun flings his latest fires
On distant mountain tops and consecrated spires:

O! then the mind of man
Delights afar to scan

The track of ages that have gone before him ;
 And visions of the past
 Crowd on his memory fast,
 And throw a spell of dreamy rapture o'er him :
 Then is the moment, then the hour,
 To mark religion's course and feel her heavenly power :
 To watch with eager eye
 The flood of time roll by,
 And woo those scenes to stay whose features win us,
 Until our lips exclaim,
 Breathing His sacred name,
 'Tis the divinity that stirs within us !
 And thou, O ! Lord, who mad'st the sun,
 And moon, and stars, and earth—thy holy will be done :'
 To see the dewy star
 In the purple west afar,
 When day is o'er, and twilight dubious lingers—
 When halcyon stillness reigns
 O'er darkening hills and plains,
 And night the curtain draws with paly fingers ;
 To feel there is a God indeed,
 And with delighted soul his holy word to read.
 How blest the happy lot
 Of many a humble cot,
 To see the Sabbath sun through lattice breaking,
 And each effulgent ray
 That gilds a summer day,
 With dazzling tints his brilliant sky-path streaking :
 To feel there is a God indeed,
 And then in evening time his precious word to read."

But as we have another book to review, and but little space to do it in, we must bring our remarks on this literary curiosity to a conclusion, and we shall do so by quoting a passage worthy of Wordsworth, and this shall be our last extract:—

" I saw them in their happiness,
 Their bright unclouded glee ;
 I saw the little favourite boy
 Who climbed his father's knee.
 That they were pious cottagers,
 Was gathered from a glance :
 For holy thoughts a sunlight give
 Unto the countenance."

We have said thus much, because we think that this unpretending little volume, from which it would be difficult to cull many brilliant thoughts, is yet well worthy of patronage. It is the picture of a calm contented mind loving the truth, and telling the truth to plain men in a plain way.

Lastly, we must bestow a few lines on a paper-bound little volume by Major Calder Campbell. Much of its contents was written in India, and refers to Indian habits and Indian scenery; but we notice it chiefly on account of the sonnets which are scattered throughout its pages. Some of these are remarkably pleasing, and not a few religious in their tendency. We select one which we like much—

“OH! feed not on disquiet, but be loth
 To make thy banquet of unhappy thoughts—
 Gathered on dismal days, when darkly floats
 A stifling haze o’er Nature.—Take no oath
 Of fealty to Discontent, nor bind
 Thy spirit to a servitude of Sin;—
 The promises she proffers are as wind,
 Which shakes the fruit it fans; and none can find
 The nook to which it flies, nor enter in
 To enforce the fond fulfilment of such vows
 As palter with us, only to betray!—
 Woo, then, a light that faileth not, but shows
 The Rock, whose power ineffable bestows
 A shelter for the weak, an ever-during stay!”

The ninth and tenth lines require a little retouching to make them quite plain. One more poem we extract, on account of its subject: it is a description of scenery, whose beauties are familiar to ourselves, and can never be forgotten, twined as they are with many sweet remembrances—

“THE FIELD OF THE FAIRY RINGS.—A SCENE NEAR TAUNTON, SOMERSET.

“ACROSS the brook that turns our mill of Trull,
 And not twice forty paces from my door,
 There is a field I love—a soft, green field
 Of English sod; what other sod so soft,
 What other grass so green? At evening, oft,
 Forth do I saunter there, and stoop to cull
 Autumnal flowers and fruits—for there are store
 Of jetty berries, such as brambles yield:
 Or, haply, seated by the stream, I pore
 Upon its waters, showing glad though grey
 Through the o’erhanging foliage—as if they
 Told me of wanderings in meads remote,
 By happy cottage homes, through pastures, green
 As these, where Industry improves the soil
 Which Nature had already blest, ere brought
 To such perfection by judicious toil—
 Toil which, thus aided, makes a fertile scene
 Of many a sterile spot!

But here, behold,
 O'er this sweet field the numerous circles, traced
 (As quaint traditions tell) by fairy feet;
 When, in the nightwatch, bright assemblies meet
 Of green-robed fays, with glistening locks of gold,
 Dancing to airy music—wild, yet sweet—
 From elfin harps among the green leaves placed!

Two stately trees of oak this field contains,
 Apart, yet not far separate—like two friends
 Divided by a temporary feud,
 And longing for each other, yet withheld
 By some ungenial feeling, which restrains
 Their meeting. Shall they no more meet, compelled
 To live asunder, thus? Yea, each forth sends
 Some spreading shoot, by which may be renewed,
 In future years, their union!

To the left
 (Here as we stand, our backs towards the mill,
 Upon the tiny bridge that spans the rill),
 O'er the next field, surrounded by its graves,
 Shines the white village-church; but more I love
 The right-hand path, that leads through leafy lanes
 To that romantic bridge,* where loudlier raves
 The bustling brook, which many a chasm hath cleft,
 Whence spring the hispid comfrey; and, above,
 In rich exuberance, spotted ivy trains
 A drapery o'er the loftier trees. Here glows
 The crimson berry of the guelder-rose,
 Whose vine-like leaves have caught a sanguine stain
 From the October sun. Down in the grass,
 And blushing through green blades, Herb-Robert fain
 Would catch the eyes of pilgrims as they pass,
 Who seek for rarer plants. The Arum, there,
 Now leafless, lifts its ruby sceptre—red
 As coral rocks that stud the sea-nymph's bed;
 Pale agrimony scents the evening air
 With a faint lemon odour; and around
 The roseate mallow in profusion springs.
 But dews fall heavily to drench the ground,
 And I retrace my steps; the trees I pass—
 I pass the mystic circles in the grass,
 And, as I leave the scene, within my mind
 A name (a name that will not last) I find,
 And call that field, the FIELD O' THE FAIRY RINGS."

And now we shake hands with the Major, and assure him
 hat his volume has given us unmixed pleasure. It will be said

* Batt's Bridge.

that the works which we have noticed are not of so high an order as to secure immortality for their authors: perhaps not—but they show, and for that reason do we quote them, that even in this age of spinning jennies and railroads, and steam and gas, and daguerrotypes and electrotints—when the work of the painter is done for him by the sun and the air, and the work of the labourer is done for him by steam, so that he has nothing to do but to starve in quiet—even in this “march of mind,” “go-a-head” age, there are still those who believe in the beautiful, and seek after it, and have not in their mouths the everlasting *cui bono* of the political economist. Human nature is, alas! frail and fallen; but it is not so utterly and entirely depraved as to love evil *for its own sake*; and wheresoever we find any aspirations after the lovely and the true, there do we find the remnants of that paradisaic nature, which shall one day be restored, and *on which remnants* the Holy Spirit acts, in bringing man to a feeling of his sinful estate, and exciting him to *faith* in the Son of God. This is, we believe, the philosophy of poetry.

Hints from a Schoolmistress to Mothers, Daughters, and Governesses, on the application of the Principles of Education London: Painter. 1842.

THE great merit of this small but useful volume is, that it does in reality what it professes to do, i. e., it reduces its own lessons to practice. There is so much in our day of vague generalization, that it is really a treat to find something so tangible and well-defined as is the matter given us by the “Schoolmistress.”

The Collects of the Liturgy of the Church of England catechetically explained. By the Rev. Charles Miller, A.B. London: Seeleys. 1842.

IN every respect these catechetical explanations are valuable. They are the sound, clear, practical productions of a true evangelical High Churchman. Need we say more?

Observations on the Book of Ruth, and on the word “Redeemer.” By the Rev. H. B. Macartney. Dublin: Curry. 1842.

MR. MACARTNEY has in this little book compressed much sound and valuable matter. That the volume is a very small one will be no disadvantage in the eyes of those for whom it is principally intended; and that it is one which develops much experience will be a great advantage. The observations on the word “Redeemer” are particularly good.

Rational Reading Lessons ; or Intellectual Exercises for Children. Edinburgh : Oliver and Boyd. 1842.

THIS book is a sequel to the diversions of Hollycot, and its object is to exercise the mind, as well as the memory, by making the youthful reader supply words purposely left wanting. The plan is a good one, and has been tried with success, but we think these lessons rather too difficult.

Twenty-one Plain Doctrinal and Practical Sermons. By the Rev. C. J. Fynes Clinton, M.A., Rector of Cromwell, and Vicar of Orston, Notts., formerly Vicar of Strensall, Yorkshire. London : Painter.

It is with regret that in an age of growing intelligence on Church subjects, we find any one disseminating the errors of puritanism ; that regret is increased when the person so doing is a clergyman, and more especially when, not contented with the pulpit, he makes the press the vehicle of his opinions. The case of Mr. Clinton is one which we are really very sorry to meet with. We find very erroneous notions here upon baptism ; and the name and position of the writer, together with the piety which is manifest in his volume, do but make his doctrinal errors more conspicuous.

SERMONS.

1. *Sermons on various subjects.* By Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D., Vicar of Leeds. London : Rivingtons. 1842.
2. *The Consistency of the Divine Conduct in revealing the Doctrines of Redemption, being the Hulsean Lectures for the year 1841 : to which are added, Two Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge.* By Henry Alford, M.A. Cambridge : Deighton. 1842.
3. *Sermons on Church-building.* By the Rev. J. A. Emerton, M.A., Curate of Hanwell, Middlesex. London : Hatchards.
4. *Three Discourses. On the Divine Will—on Acquaintance with God—on Revelation.* By A. J. Scott, A.M. London : Darling. 1842.
5. *Six Plain Sermons.* By Philalethes. London : Hatchards.
6. *Sermons.* By the Rev. T. Tunstall Smith, M.A., Curate of St. Luke's, Chelsea. London : Hatchards. 1842.
7. *Lectures on the Liturgy ; addressed to his Pupils.* By the Rev. John Bental, M.A., one of the ushers of Westminster School. London : Parker. 1842.

THAT anything can proceed from Dr. Hook unworthy of notice would not be believed, even by Presbyterians ; and the volume of his Sermons, which is now lying before us, is, though tinged

throughout with the spirit of Tractarianism, distinguished by talent and learning. Mr. Alford is, however, more to our taste, and his Hulsæan Lectures are a witness against the doctrine of reserve, which, though not expressly levelled against it, all the jesuitism of our day cannot put down. Such is by far the best mode of combating the Tracts when the pulpit is used: preach the truth, and you necessarily contradict whatever is in contradiction to the truth. This Mr. Alford has done, and his sermons are valuable both for the soundness of their theology and the beauty of their style. Mr. Emerton's discourses are excellently adapted to their intended object; and as they put the question of Church-building in the right light, they will, we hope, be useful beyond the parish of Hanwell. There is a metaphysical character about the sermons of Mr. Scott, which, to the acute mind, is particularly pleasing, and which will render them acceptable to a very high class of readers. Those by Philalethes, on the other hand, are simple and plain to the greatest degree; they are, however, sound and practical, nor are those of Mr. Bentall less so. These last are especially adapted for families, as they were addressed by the excellent author to his own pupils at Westminster. We can recommend them to schoolmasters in general. On the sermons of Mr. Tunstall Smith, now no longer one of our metropolitan clergy, we must say somewhat more, as they are of a more peculiar character.

We have given more time to the perusal of this volume than we are able usually to give to works of this class, and feel happy in recording our satisfaction on closing the book, not because we were weary of it, but because we were pleased with it. There is good Churchmanship, and there is that with which we rejoice to see it accompanied, sound scriptural doctrine, in these sermons. Occasionally they rise into much nerve and eloquence, without the cloud-capping and bombast by which mere attempt is usually characterized. The style is practical without being undignified, and penetrating, without affecting the metaphysical. The subjects are well divided, and the subordinate topics conspicuously presented, not so much always by formal enunciation, as by a certain graphic exhibition in the mode of treatment. This we conceive to be a good feature in sermons, and is one of the characters by which this excellent volume is distinguished.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

**This book is under no circumstances to be
taken from the Building**

[illegible]



